DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 389 RC 009 663

AUTHOR	Haynes, Alan E.
TITLE	The Community Assessment System.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Ottawa (Ontario).; Saskatchewan Univ., Saskatoon.
PUB DATE	Jan 76
NOTE	208p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Analysis of Variance; *Community Attitudes; *Community Characteristics; Community Planning; *Economic Development; Employment Opportunities; Environmental Influences; Factor Analysis; Program Development; *Research Methodology; *Rural Areas; *Social Development; Social Structure
IDENTIFIERS	*Community Assessment System; Saskatchewan (Unity)

ABSTRACT

The Community Assessment System (CAS) is a research technique designed to probe small, rural community perceptions and attitudes toward planned economic expansion and social development by generating suggestions for general or specific community modifications; ascertaining community attitudes and possible responses to a specific modification; providing insight into relationships between community orientations and community structures; monitoring community assessments during the stages of any actual development program. Using traditional social science research methodology, CAS calls for analysis of the interrelationships between attitudinal and structural (occupation, influence, community participation, age, sex, religion, ethnicity, and years of residence) variables. Employing factor analysis and analysis of variance of the factor scores, CAS provides a large amount of information that is summarized and structured. Having been tested in one community (Unity, Saskatchewan), CAS generated 17 factors which were interpreted as 6 "assessment sets" as follows: Environment and Life (community environment, solidarity, and life and social interaction); Diversity and Growth (social diversity, attitudes toward change, and future growth); Development (agricultural and urban economic); Local Control (environmental, business, and unskilled labor); Employment Opportunities (blue and white collar job opportunities); Income Support Systems (financial, job, and mobility). Providing for area specific assessments, CAS should prove valuable to community planners. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134389

THE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prof. Alan E. Haynes

RC009663

PREFACE

The Community Assessment System is a research technique designed to identify, describe and analyze attitudes of a community population toward local economic and social development. The technique has been developed in response to a growing demand that decision makers and planners take attitudinal information into account when attempting environmental planning. The Community Assessment System presents information about a wide range of attitudes related to local expansion and development as reliably, comprehensively, usefully, inexpensively and quickly as possible. The techniques of investigation should be of interest to those responsible for establishing and maintaining social and human services in communities.

To date, the Community Assessment System has been developed and tested in one community. Further applications will increase confidence in the reliability and ability of the technique to analyze and interpret a wide range of data. The Community Assessment System utilizes techniques of data gathering and analysis developed and tested in the social sciences. However, these techniques have not been sufficiently developed to handle a broad spectrum of attitudinal information from a relatively small community, which is what the Community Assessment System is designed to do. The maximum community size to which the Community Assessment System can usefully be applied has not been established. It is recommended that the instruments be applied only to communities which researchers can clearly delineate and which inhabitants clearly conceptualize as their community. The instruments are primarily designed for use in what are broadly referred to as "rural" or small and geographically distinct communities.

The contribution of the Community Assessment System lies in its scientific attempt to study attitudes toward development without distorting them. The theoretical framework through which the data are interpreted in generated from the data itself, using factor analysis. In this manner, the theory is empirically grounded rather than being imposed upon the data by the researchers. Attitudinal dimensions generated in this way truly reflect the local population's concerns about the various futures possible for their community. Planners and decision makers, both local and non-local, can thus determine in advance not only the wishes of community members but also the scale of their vision and their possible reactions to particular types of community modification.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following members of the research team without whose efforts the completion of this project would not have been possible:

Research Assistant:	Michael Manley
Interviewers:	Gwen Morrison-Gray Douglas Frey
Computor Programmers:	David Katz Stewart Goldie
Coder:	Pat Gage

Special thanks must be given to my colleagues: Gerry McPherson for her time and help in editing and preparing the manuscript, Peter Li and David Hay for their suggestions and advice during the analysis phase of the project. I would like also to thank our secretaries whose unfailing response could always be counted upon. We are all grateful to the Federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, the University of Saskatchewan and the Department of Sociology for contributing the financial assistance necessary to conduct the research. Finally we would like to thank the people of

Unity, Saskatchewan for their time, interest and helpful support.

Alan Haynes
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Saskatchewan

January 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE i

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

CHAPTER I: THE NEED FOR A COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM 1

Deficiencies of Present Techniques 5
Concluding Note to Chapter One 10

CHAPTER II: THE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: GOALS 11

Rationale of a Community Profile 13
C.A.S.: Time and Location Specific 15
Problems Related to Attitude Measurement 17

CHAPTER III: THE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM 19

Sampling the Community 20
Structural Variables 24
The Interview Schedule 26
High School Questionnaire 28
The Research Team 29
Entrance into the Community 31
Interviewing Procedure 32
Analysis Procedures 35
C.A.S. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 40
C.A.S. DATA CODING FORM 75

CHAPTER IV: DEMONSTRATION: THE UNITY STUDY. 76

Interpretation Perspectives 76
Presentation of the Data 77
Presentation and Interpretation of Factors 90
Assessment Sets 90
Assessment Set 1: ENVIRONMENT AND LIFE 91
    Community Environment 91
    Community Solidarity 92
    Community Life 94
    Social Interaction 97

Page

The Retired 99
High School Students 100
Factor Variables 100
Communication Networks and Information Flows 109

ASSESSMENT SET 2: DIVERSITY AND GROWTH 113

Social Diversity 113
Attitudes Toward Change 116
Future Growth 116

The Retired 117
High School Students 118
Factor Variables 118

ASSESSMENT SET 3: DEVELOPMENT 124

Agricultural Development 124
Urban Economic Development 126
The Retired 129

High School Students 129
Factor Variables 129
Communication Networks and Information Flows 133

ASSESSMENT SET 4: LOCAL CONTROL 143

Environmental Control 143
Business Control 145
Control and Unskilled Labour 145

The Retired 146
High School Students 146
Factor Variables 147

ASSESSMENT SET 5: EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES 152

Blue Collar Job Opportunities 152
White Collar Job Opportunities 152

The Retired 155
High School Students 155
Factor Variables 156

Page

ASSESSMENT SET 6: INCOME SUPPORT SYSTEMS 160

Financial Support 160
Job Support 161
Mobility 161

The Retired 162
High School Students 162
Factor Variables 163

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY 168

CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED FOR A COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Scientifically analyzed subjective information together with statistical social information must form the essential core of social knowledge required by decision makers when they plan projects that affect communities and regions. Statistical social information such as that compiled from census data (e.g., population size, population change, size of work force) can be used to describe the structural components of communities. However, perceptions and judgments (the sum total of which may be described as "assessments") of individuals or groups cannot be directly inferred from this statistical information. Since individual and group attitudes and assessments influence the reactions that people have to community modifications, it is essential that decision makers pay attention to such attitudes and assessments as well as to the relationships between these assessments and the structures of a community. This subjective information is even more important if community populations are to have some input in determining what types of futures they deem acceptable.

Subjective information is essential for reasonable and rational planning. Potential resources near or within the community may be discovered through the insights and suggestions of local inhabitants. Going directly to a population to gather attitudinal information serves another practical need. The population knows that its opinions and assessments are significant to decision makers.

Those responsible for making decisions which modify social and non-social environments are discovering that they need more information about social dynamics than has been relied upon in the past. The social information base must be reliable and adequate if decisions are to take into account the human social dimension in planning community modification. Decisions must be informed by both subjective and statistical social information if communities are to absorb and adapt to the introduction of technological capabilities with minimum social strain, disruption and modifications to the quality of life.

Responsible community planning demands interdependence between information and decision making. Implicit in the very concept of planning is a rejection of the decision making strategy which C. E. Lindblom describes as "disjointed incrementalism".[1] Planning, by definition, demands that decision making be more rational and comprehensive than simple stop-gap policies. Policy decisions based upon partial information or the exigencies of the moment cannot be satisfactory in the long run. Planning, and in particular environmental planning, demands a more holistic conceptualization of both goals and means.

The rational model of strategy of decision making suffers from the fact that it conveys utopian idealism. It assumes that decision makers have at their disposal all necessary information relative to a given prospect; are able to digest, evaluate, weigh this information; and rationally proceed to devise proper policies and decisions. On all accounts, such an assumption verges upon the naive.

---

[1] See: C. E. Lindblom, "The Intelligence of Democracy", Free Press, 1965 . See also: Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, Politics Economics, and Welfare: Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes (N.Y. Harper and Brothers, 1953).

A. Etzioni's mixed scanning strategy for decision making seems to provide a desirable middle ground between the extreme models of incrementalism and rationalism.[2] Mixed scanning involves two distinct but complementary activities:

1. Fundamental decisions which are made by "exploring the main alternatives the actor sees in view of his conception of goals but...details and specifications are omitted so that an overview is feasible."
2. Incremental decisions are made "...within the context set by fundamental decisions" and when fundamental decisions are reviewed.[3]

It follows that planning requires information at different levels of generality and specificity related to any given prospect or proposal. M. Gibbons and R. Voyer have recently developed a "Technology Assessment System" which is designed to assess those social groups (people, organizations, industries, government, etc.) which are--or should be--concerned with developing a given technological capability in a community, area or region. A technological capability is defined as more than technological hardware; it "..includes the complex of organizational and individual skills which operate on hardware to produce a capability.[4] They define technology assessment as "..an activity to provide information about, and systematic analysis of, the internal and external consequences (short, medium and long term) for a society of the application and diffusion of a technological capability into its physical, social, economic, and political system.[5]

---

[2] A. Etzioni, The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes, Free Press, 1968.

[3] Ibid. p. 22.

[4] M. Gibbons and R. Voyer, A Technology Assessment System: A Case Study of East Coast Offshore Petroleum Exploration, Science Council of Canada, Background Study No. 39, 1974, p. 22.

The Technology Assessment System is thus a descriptive summary of the various assessments of social actors which provides the information base upon which fundamental and, on occasion, incremental decisions are made. Gibbons and Voyer distinguish three classes of actors by their degree of involvement with the planning and development of a given technological capability:[6]

> Core Actors: These would be relatively few, such as particular industries, businesses, governmental departments or agencies which would be intimately and continuously interested and involved in the entire process of development from planning to completion.
>
> Supporting Actors: a more numerous group, each having some interest in one or more aspects of the development. The groups would include special interest groups, government departments or agencies tangentially concerned with a particular proposal, businesses or industries which might become involved at some stage of the development.
>
> "Should be" Actors: actors who would be affected by the decisions made but who do not, by definition, have any input into the process for any number of reasons.

Gibbons and Voyer note several primary deficiencies in the information base constituted by inputs from the core and supporting actors: a) most studies are solely concerned with the internal consequences of development for which the particular actor is responsible; b) little attention is paid to the consequences which lie outside the responsibility of the actor; c) most studies deal mainly with short or medium term concerns; d) the interests of certain groups do not seem to be taken into account or are not considered in any detail; e) interactions among actors are not noted and thus the complexity of social processes involved in the development is not considered.

---

[5] Ibid, p. 26.

[6] Ibid, p. 70.

Only the core and supporting actors contribute to the collection and analysis of information. The "should be" actors, by definition, do not contribute to the information base. This may make the T.A.S. less than complete or reliable. "Should be" actors are conceptualized by Gibbons and Voyer as social interest groups, organizations, industries, etc., who either do not perceive themselves as being affected by a given development or consider the possible effects of the development as only tagentially or insignificantly affecting them. Among other reasons for noninvolvement might be size, political organization, financial resources, lack of organization, or lack of knowledge about the proposals. The problem of compiling an adequate information base rests upon identifying these groups and developing means by which their opinions might be assessed.

In their discussion of possible "should be" actors, Gibbons and Voyer do not include the community (collectively or individually) which must absorb and adapt to the introduction of a technological capability. This is an important deficiency. Any attempt to analyze social systems, processes and structures of a community without acknowledging the interests, perceptions, judgments--the assessments--of the inhabitants must fall short of the goals of fundamental policy making. The potentially-affected community must be considered as a major "should be" actor whose input into the information base is essential to responsible planning.[7]

DEFICIENCIES OF PRESENT TECHNIQUES

That subjective social information is needed for decision making is not a new insight. Decision makers have used various means to ascertain the "feelings", opinions, judgments and reactions of social groups to Community modification. For example, public hearings have been used by government, industry and special commissions to tap these realities. But public hearings have not proved adequate. They do provide a forum for organized and relatively articulate social groups to submit objections to or approval for proposed modifications. Zealous advocates of various positions are also able to make their views known. In general, however, relatively select portions of any given population are represented at such hearings. Presentations made by professional research groups on behalf of parties having primary interests in the hearings, e.g., core and supporting actors, attempt to rise above the level of special interests. But even these presentations do not give a systematic profile of the subjective perceptions and assessments of the community population to be affected. Organized groups (unions, associations, clubs, corporations, etc.) have a greater chance to provide input into the decision-making process than do unorganized groups and individuals. Frequently, therefore, groups formed on the basis of non-local orientations have a voice, whereas the population of a community--viewed as having only a local orientation--must be content with having less influence on decision making.

---

[7] For a multi-disciplinary discussion on public participation in the environmental management decision making process see: Ask The People, C. G. Morley (Ed.), Agassiz Centre for Water Studies, n.d.

Since the development of Systems Analysis and more recently Systems Dynamics, decision makers and planners have been turning to computor modeling for assistance in rational planning and policy making. Systems analysis and systems dynamics are concerned with extrapolating social consequences from statistical data.

Social data about a population must include subjective dispositions as well as concrete statistical information. The use of closed systems analysis is extremely limited in situations in which there are intervening variables such as social resistance. When the situation being analyzed does not allow for possible unforeseen subjective interventions, the closed system analysis fails to maintain its predictive validity. It becomes difficult, if not impossible, to foresee the ultimate costs (social and economic) of implementing a program of community modification or the possible complete failure of the project itself.

The subjective dimension must, because of its very nature, be limited to the present attitudes, values and priorities of people. It is precisely because the subjective consequences of introduced change cannot easily or without limitations be included within the computor "programme" that failures in planning, especially short term planning, occur. These failures indicate the inability of modeling to tap the attitudes, values, perceptions and judgments of a population.

Social Impact Studies are also at times requested by decision makers and planners. These studies, although few in number, are difficult to assess because no general agreement exists as to exactly what constitute "Social Impact Studies". Generally, it can be assumed that they are supposed to analyze the consequences of introducing certain technological capabilities. Their methodological deficiency is the same as that of systems analysis. A community is a reality; it is not a model. Individuals' attitudes and judgments change, often without apparent reason. Attitudes and feelings cannot be predicted; they may only be assessed. The only reliable assessment must be through asking the individuals within a population what they think about things.

At this time, few social impact studies exist which are not wholly economic in nature and orientation. Few studies have been conducted utilizing the knowledge or expertise of social scientists other than economists. One important exception to this is the "Social & Economic Impact Study of the Lake Winnipeg Churchill-Nelson Rivers Hydro Development" and its accompanying technical report, "Social Change and Stress: A Focus on Northern Development."[8] The Social aspects of this study concentrate upon analyzing communities of the region affected, in order to lessen the stress or strain resulting from the proposed hydro development. A total of thirty-five residents living in at least ten different communities were interviewed for this study. The respondents were selected at random from community voters' lists. In addition, ten people having professional relationships with the communities involved and ten people designated as "leaders" by the professional group were interviewed.

Social Indicators, an approach within the social sciences that can be called a "movement", are being looked at by planners at the present time. The "movement" had its origins in the mid-1960's when American social scientists expressed dissatisfaction with the traditional economic indicators (unemployment rates, income per head, etc.) as adequate measures of social improvement. The paradox--that material prosperity is sometimes linked with frustration and that apparent satisfaction with life is expressed by some who live in poverty--has led social scientists to argue that "quality of life" can be better assessed by bringing together a range of other statistics, such as rates of crime detection, number of prescriptions dispensed, size of school classes, number of flush toilets, etc..[9]

---

[8] Social & Economic Impact Study of the Lake Winnipeg Churchill-Nelson Rivers Hydro Development ,Prepared by the Social & Economic Impact Study team, Planning Branch, Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, June, 1974. Social Change and Stress: A Focus on Northern Development, Report No. 1, June,1974.

[9] This discussion is indebted to Mark Abrams, "Social Indicators and Social Equity", New Society, 23, November, 1972; and Wilcox, Brooks, et. al., "Social Indicators: Recent Trends and Selected Bibliography", Sociological Inquiry, 42(1): 37-50, 1972; and Raymond Bauer (ed), Social Indicators, M.I.T. Press, 1966.

There are two obvious shortcomings to this approach. First, it is impossible to aggregate the variously chosen indicators into a single index of total well-being. Second, no matter what statistical indicators are considered, individuals may or may not express satisfaction with their "quality of life". Both shortcomings limit the usefulness of "social indicators" for social policy decision-making.

To attempt to overcome these two weaknesses, some American social scientists have been developing subjective measures of the "quality of life". Professor Angus Campbell of Michigan says: "The quality of life must be in the eye of the beholder and it is only through an examination of the experience of life as our people perceive it, that we will understand the human meaning of the great social and institutional changes which characterize our time."[10] Professor Campbell and Professor Norman Bradburn of Chicago have carried out nationwide sample surveys in the United States to measure, through face-to-face interviews and lengthy questionnaires, "the aspirations, attitudes, satisfactions, disappointments, grievances, expectations and values"[11] of the population. This approach comes closer to the rationale behind the present development of the Community Assessment System. However, The Community Assessment System assumes that a survey on such a wide scale, not specific to a particular locality, is too general to be useful for local community planning.

The above discussion should not be understood as a denial that economic, statistical, demographic or census data comprise one essential component of the social information base required in the planning process. Rather, it is to stress that the perceptions, attitudes and judgments of the specific community affected by modification to (or within) that community must comprise the other essential component of the social information data base. Both statistical and subjective information need to be effectively integrated in the decision-making process. Almost certainly this cannot be accomplished simply by using computor modeling techniques. Data must be synthesized and evaluated by the persons responsible for making decisions, usually the core actors themselves.

---

[10] Quoted by Abrams, Op. Cit., 1972.

[11] Ibid.

CONCLUDING NOTE TO CHAPTER ONE

The phrase "community development" has been intentionally avoided in this research presentation. The phrase is not only most difficult to define, but it also implies very distinct value judgments. "Community development" most often connotes a particular direction of change equated with "progress", specifically, "material progress". The phrase "community modification" is to be preferred since this phrase does not specifically connote material growth nor does it imply a particular direction of change. Community modification can be understood simply as designed or planned change introduced within a community which will affect either the socio-economic base, the perceived "quality of life" of the community, or both.

CHAPTER TWO

THE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: GOALS

The Community Assessment System is designed to be a practical, reliable set of instruments which provides profiles of the subjective assessments of community inhabitants concerning modifications and future prospects for their community. The general goals of the Community Assessment System (hereafter referred to as the C.A.S.) are: 1) to inform and improve decision making vis a vis planned modifications in a community; 2) to ascertain assessments by the population of technological capabilities which might be planned for a community; and 3) to provide a point of departure for changing or altering the attitudes of community members in order to aid them to cope with and adapt to change.

The introduction of a technological capability into a community must be considered most seriously in terms of its consequences for the community. The effects of technology, whether positive or negative, anticipated or unanticipated, are manifested not only in the social and political structures of society but in the very ways man sees, thinks about, and relates to his world: "the effects of technology do not occur at the level of opinions or concepts, but alter sense ratios or patterns of perception...."[12] The primary purpose of the C.A.S. is to discover the way a population views the desirability of planned change.

---

[12] Taken from Marshall McLuhan as quoted in Albert H. Teich, Technology and Man's Future, St. Martin's Press, N.Y., 1972, p. 68.

Through use of the C.A.S., it becomes possible to ascertain the limits within which modifications to the community will be accepted without causing social disruption, the type of social environment which is judged as adequate by the inhabitants of a community, the process and structures within the community which influence assessments, and finally, the inhabitants' judgments about their own community's specific and practical needs. Community populations can also suggest possible types of developments, expansion and improvements which might be of interest to some decision making agencies. Local inhabitants can often give invaluable suggestions and practical insights into what technologies or modifications may be feasible as well as socially acceptable and desirable.

It should not be accepted without question that a community must absorb and adapt to a technological capability without the technology itself being modified to "fit" the community. Usually, technological capabilities are introduced into communities without altering or adapting them to the local situation. The effective and rapid diffusion of technological capabilities demands that communities must adapt to standardized technology. However, decision makers in both government and industry need to be sensitive to community needs by at least attempting to develop innovative ways to adapt technological capabilities to specific needs. To this end, planners must take into account both the assessments of a community population and their priorities.

The need for reliable instruments to illuminate the reactions of a community to technological change is not generally acknowledged. However, this need may come to be recognized when the social consequences of technology, oriented and adapted to more populous localities in Canada, become unacceptable to populations which to date have not had to cope with latent technological effects, in particular, the small rural communities relatively isolated from metropolitan centres. When people in a small rural Saskatchewan town express their need for a bakery, they do not necessarily imply they can adapt to or absorb an outlet of a national franchised baking company. In the same manner, when native peoples in the north express a need for adequate housing, one should not assume that the complex and sophisticated housing technology utilized in southern Canada can be absorbed by the local northern community.

RATIONALE OF A COMMUNITY SUBJECTIVE PROFILE

In order to achieve the goals of the C.A.S. the investigator should conceptualize the community as the "setting" (cultural, social, physical, etc.) in which a population is geographically located at a given period of time. Sharing the local setting is the common reality for the inhabitants of a community. Conceptualizing the community as having locality relevance reflects the insights of many sociologists and anthropologists.[13]

Local communities can be equated with the individuals making up the population--because if the people were to leave, the community would cease to exist. However, if, at one level, people constitute the community, at another, the structures and organization of a community exist as realities outside or beyond the individuals who make up the community population at any given time.

Communities can be analyzed according to their "structure", that is, those patterns of relationships which are to some degree organized and perpetuated in time. Variables used to describe community structure, might include population size, age composition, groups, organizations, degrees of community participation, etc..[14] Communities may also be compared to one another in terms of their relative degrees of "structural differentiation". The degree of differentiation is similar to "complexity", "diversity", or "increase in scale" of the structures within the community. The degree to which a community is structurally differentiated will, to a great extent, be determined by the size of the population. The degree of differentiation is important when comparing communities.[15] The more complex a community is, the larger the sample that must be drawn in order to assess it.

---

[13] See Henry Zentner, Prelude to Administrative Theory, Strayer Publications, Canada, 1973; Conrad M. Arensberg and Solon T. Kimball, Culture and Community, Harcourt and Brace & World, N.Y., 1965, to cite only two of many.

Previous studies have determined that a relationship exists between community structure and social attitudes.[16] A relationship has also been shown to exist between community structure and individual responses to particular issues.[17] It would be invalid, however, to imply that an individual's position within the community social structure "causes" his attitudes and perceptions. It can only be asserted that the intensity and types of attitudes people hold are significantly related to community structure. Therefore, the social scientist should probe and analyze attitudes, perceptions and assessments within a community with reference to the structure of that community.[18]

---

[14] Hodge, Gerald "Branch Line Abandonment: Death Knell for Prairie Towns?" Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, XVI (1968), 54-70, uses the following variables to determine dimensions of community structure: population size, ethnic and religious composition, value of physical development, agricultural base, age of population and of community, and employment and labour force.

[15] For a list of variables often used to compare differentiation between communities see: Kenneth A. Mozersky, "The Structural Determinants of Individual Perceptions to Social Change in Western Canadian Communities" Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 21, No. 1, Feb, 1973, 27-40.

[16] Dean L. R., Five Towns, A Comparative Community Study. New York: Random House, 1967.

[17] Kammeyer, K. "A Comparative Study of Decision making in Rural Communities", in Terry N. Clark, ed. Community Structure and Decision Making: Comparative Analsyes. San Francisco Chandler Publishing Co., 1968, 383-391.

The community can be analyzed at any given point in its history by analyzing a cross section of the population. In this way, history and biography are seen to intersect at any given point in time.[19] On the concrete level, the community is a specific population of individuals bound together through relationships arising from the social and physical enviroments in which that population is located, both temporally and spatially.

The C.A.S. assumes that the assessments of a community can be determined by examining a cross-section of the population. The C.A.S. uses occupational categories to draw a representative sample of the adult population. In this manner, relationships between community structure and attitudes may be identified and analyzed. The objectives of the C.A.S. will be met if the individuals selected as representative of all segments of a local community reveal their assessments of the future of their community and of their own personal future within that community. The techniques used to construct these objective profiles of how various groups within a community assess their collective future must not interfere with or distort the subjective contents.

C.A.S.: TIME AND LOCATION SPECIFIC

As has been suggested, it is impossible to predict with accuracy future changes in subjective dispositions and assessments. The information compiled and analyzed by the C.A.S. must, therefore, be time specific. The information is collected from a local population at a particular time and in the context of a specific conjuncture of events. Subjective information cannot be extrapolated into the future, because people are able to change their minds at will and often do so in ways which are incomprehensible to an observer. It cannot be assumed that assessments made by a population will remain constant over a long period of time. It can be strongly suggested, however, that the assessments of a population tend to be "ingrained" and "mentally routinized" over some period of time. The information gathered and analyzed by the C.A.S. may be assumed to be relatively stable.

---

[18] The methodological problems have received attention by Blau, P.M. "Structural Effects". American Sociological Review, XXV (1960), 178-193, Robinson, W.S. "Ecological Correlations and the Behaviour of Individuals." American Sociological Review, XV (1950), 351-357, and Tannenbaum, A.S. and J. G. Bachman. "Structural Versus Individual Effects." American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (1964), 585-595. See also: Kenneth A. Mozersky, op. cit. 27-40).

[19] See C. W. Mills, The Sociological Imagination, Oxford University Press 1959.

When a particular plan for community modification becomes public knowledge, changes may occur in the assessments held by those inhabitants who perceive their individual lives and futures as threatened. For this reason, the C.A.S., in full or modified form, should be readministered during the most significant stages of the community modification process. The present form of the C.A.S. is primarily designed to be administered before actual community modification, since one of its purposes is to determine what modifications might succeed in a community. However, this instrument can be modified so that it could be used to probe assessments at various stages of the modification process. It whould also be noted that publication of the results from the application of the C.A.S. within a community might itself lead to changed assessments. It is, of course, also possible that planners may attempt to change assessments. The information supplied by a C.A.S. study could be used in this way.[20]

---

[20] For discussion of how social science information is used to manipulate populations, see: The Use and Abuse of Social Science, Irving Louis Horowitz (ed), Transition Books, 1975.

It is possible that particular groups in the community may not accept as valid the objective findings of the C.A.S. This may happen even though the assessments of these segments of the population have been included within the overall profile produced by the C.A.S. It is, therefore, important to make explicit that the validity of the C.A.S. does not rest upon the consensus of specific groups within the community. Rather, its validity rests upon the techniques used to gather and analyze the subjective data and the degree of consistency of its findings. The latter can only be demonstrated by multiple successful applications of the technique.

As well as being time specific, the C.A.S. is location specific. Its findings in any particular community should not be generalized to other communities. The C.A.S. describes and analyzes assessments within a particular population. It cannot be validly argued from the results of one application of the C.A.S. that similar assessments will be found in "similar" communities. The C.A.S. is concerned only with presenting in a reliable and comprehensible way the assessments, feelings and suggestions of a particular population about their future as individuals and as a community.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

The process of measuring attitudes is complicated because attitudes are not directly observable. Attitudes must be inferred from behaviour or expressed verbally to a researcher in order to be identified and analyzed. All social scientists agree that an attitude is a predisposition to respond to an object, rather than the actual behaviour toward such an object; that an attitude is persistent over time, a fact which contributes greatly to the consistency of behaviour; and that an attitude has a motivational, or directional, quality.[21]

---

[21] Gene Summers, Attitude Measurement, 1970, p. 2., Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, 1970.

Daniel Katz's conceptualization of attitudes has proven most useful for developing the C.A.S.[22] According to Katz, an attitude has three components: cognitive, emotional, and "action tendency". The emotional component refers to the emotions or feelings attached to an object at a preverbal or non verbal level. The action tendency incorporates the behavioural readiness of the individual to respond to the object. The cognitive component comprises the beliefs and assessments one has about an object. It is this third aspect of attitude which is probed by the C.A.S. The beliefs and evaluations of people are most critical to understanding attitude as a dispositional concept. Any behaviour that reflects or manifests the individual's cognitions, particularly his evaluative beliefs and assessments about an object, may serve as a basis for inferring attitudes.

---

[22] Daniel Katz and Ezra Stotland, "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change", in Sigmund Koch, (ed). Psychology: A Study of A Science, Vol. 3, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959. See also David Krech, et al, Individual In Society, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1962.

CHAPTER THREE

THE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The C.A.S. is designed to perform four information gathering tasks:

1) identify and describe assessments of a community population which may reasonably be assumed to influence the reaction of that population to planned community modification;

2) specify and delineate groups and categories within the population which hold these assessments;

3) identify needs of the population relevant to possible modifications which might be planned for the community;

4) investigate communication and influence networks operating within the community.

The C.A.S., therefore, can be utilized for two general purposes: 1) to identify possible projects which might be introduced within a community; 2) to investigate assessments made by a population regarding a project already specified at some level of decision making. When it is desirable to apply the C.A.S. to a region within which there are a number of communities, selection of which communities to study must be considered. If the communities of the region are similar with respect to geography, resources and social differentiation, then they may be treated as one population. If, however, the region contains communities of different types, the researchers must apply the C.A.S. to communities representative of each of the community types within the region.

Since, for the present purpose, the C.A.S. is applied to a single community, it has not been necessary to specify its degree of social structural differentiation. The degree of structural differentiation is significant only when comparing communities. The specification of structural differentiation will also be important in any future development of the C.A.S. If data were collected from a number of communities that had a similar degree of differentiation, the sample size would be sufficiently large, relative to the number of attitudinal variables, that factor analysis could be used in a precise fashion to outline significant clusters of the attitudinal variables. This would enhance the value and statistical reliability of the C.A.S. instrument.[23]

SAMPLING THE COMMUNITY

The community population must first be defined or delineated by the researcher. Determining the membership boundaries of a community must in the final analysis by somewhat arbitrary.[24] If the population of a community includes only those persons who live within the legally defined geographical boundaries of the town or city, much of the problem would easily be solved. However, many administrative districts overlap municipal boundaries, e.g., school districts, service areas. Also, no exact boundaries can be drawn which distinctly separate one community from another. Nonspecified areas exist between communities which are related to more than one particular community.

The most recent election enumeration lists provide the most effective and acceptable method of delineating a town or city and its surrounding area. For the purposes of the C.A.S., the community population from which a representative sample is drawn can be defined on the basis of the voting districts of the town or city proper and its surrounding areas. This method of defining a community population has been used in previous community studies.[25] The enumeration lists include all eligible voters, but exclude individuals who were for some reason missed in the final enumeration--persons under voting age, landed immigrants, aliens, etc..

---

[23] For a complete description of the techniques used in determining the structural differentiation of communities see: K. Mozersky: "Structural Differentiation of Community: An Analysis of Western Canadian Communities Undergoing Change." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1970. See also: K. Mozersky, op.cit., 1973.

[24] For discussion of community sampling see Arensberg and Kimball, op.cit., p. 7 28.

In the study used to construct and test the C.A.S., the most recent enumeration lists were requested from the Chief Electoral Officer of the province. These included not only the polling divisions within the town proper but also the surrounding farming area. A provincial election had been called for June 11, 1975. The election lists for the town of Unity, Saskatchewan, had thus been compiled less than one month before the sample was drawn. Enumeration lists used to draw the sample were: "List of Voters--Wilkie Constituency", polling divisions numbers: 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33. The latter polling division covered the surrounding farm district.

The researcher must ensure that the sample population adequately represents the various segments present in the total population. Sampling according to occupation provides the best means of doing this, since enumeration lists include not only names and addresses of the population eligible to vote but also provide information on occupation. A reliable cross sectional sample of the population can be drawn from these lists.

Occupations in Canada have been scaled by Bernard R. Blishen in his "Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada."[26] Blishen's index scales occupations along three dimensions: income, education and prestige. Scaling using these dimensions creates several difficulties; for example, "nurses-in-training" are scaled higher (49.91) than "graduate nurses" (42.57) because of the interaction of the dimensions upon the index.

---

[25] See Manitoba Study, op.cit., p. 415 ff.

[26] A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Bernard R. Blishen, in Canadian Society, Sociological Perspectives, Bernard R. Blishen et. al., (eds.), 3rd Ed., Macmillan of Canada, 1971, 495-509.

Although scaling occupations makes statistical analysis easier, Blishen's index does not provide a classification of occupations. Such a classification is necessary in order to draw an occupational sample which is representative of the community. Peter C. Pineo and John Porter[27] present lists of occupations clustered into categories. Pineo-Porter use average evaluation made of an occupational title by a national sample to establish the social standing of the occupation.

The C.A.S. adapted the categories presented by Pineo-Porter in order to classify the occupations found in the enumeration lists into nine categories: 1) farmer; 2) farmwife; 3) housewife; 4) unskilled; 5) skilled; 6) clerical and sales; 7) proprietors, managers and municipal officials; 8) semi-professional and professional; and 9) retired. Persons listed in the first eight categories are considered to be "career adults" of the population. The "retired", because their relationship to the community is essentially different from the career adults, are analyzed separately. A sample of high school students is also analyzed separately, not only because they have a distinctive and different relationship to the community than do career adults, but also because, in the community used to test and develop the C.A.S., the method used to draw the high school sample as well as the method of investigation (a questionnaire) was unique to this group.

Using a table of random numbers, a sample from each occupational category can be drawn. The size of the sample should approach ten percent (10%) of the actual population in each occupational category.[28] The sample size must take into account the degree of accuracy desired in the study, the cost per unit of data collection, the diversity or heterogeneity of the population, the type of sampling design used and the subsequent analysis the researcher wishes to do with the data. Large samples do not guarantee representativeness and costs increase with the size of the sample. It is essential that the representativeness of the sample be ensured. The sample can be checked against the census to ensure that the population is adequately represented in the sample drawn.

---

[27] Pineo, Peter C., Porter, John, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", in James Curtis & William Scott, Social Stratification: Canada, Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1973, 55-69.

In Unity, Saskatchewan, the target community in the development of the C.A.S., it was planned to interview approximately ten persons from each of the occupational categories. At the end of the interview period from seven to fifteen persons within each occupational category had been interviewed. The category samples were statistically weighted in the analysis phase of the research to represent the percentage of the population in each occupational category according to the enumeration lists.[29]

Special attention should be paid to interviewing a proportionate number of males and females in each of the categories. In the Unity study, as a result of the refusal rate, the sample disproportionately represents females over males. Having weighted the samples occupationally, it is not possible to also weight them for sex. The drawn sample closely approximated the actual population except that there was a high refusal rate of males in the occupational categories of "clerical & sales" and "unskilled". However, the actual number of males in the category "clerical & sales" is so small that one might expect to find no males occuring in that sample.

---

[28] See Hubert Blalock, Social Statistics, 1972, McGraw-Hill, Toronto, pp. 213-215 for discussion of statistically determining sample size.

[29] Chapter IV, table 2, p. 79.

STRUCTURAL VARIABLES

The major structural variables, other than occupation, used to analyze the sample are: age, sex, religion, ethnicity, years of residence in the community and community participation. Age is broken down into six categories: 20-29/30-39/40-49/50-59/60-69/70+. Religion and ethnicity are broken down following the categories defined by the Canadian Census. However, for purposes of analysis the breakdown should be collapsed into a smaller number of categories, particularly adapted to the community being studied. In Unity, Saskatchewan, for example, the 1971 Census revealed for religious affiliation - United Church of Canada, 37.22%; Roman Catholic, 36.5%; Anglican, 7.3%; all other religious groupings, 10.0%; and for ethnicity - British Isles, 48.8%; German, 35.8%; and all other ethnic groups, 15.4%. Therefore, in the analysis, the religious categories were defined as United Church, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Other; the ethnic categories were defined as British Isles, German and Other.

To define the variable "community participation", all respondents were asked to list the organizations to which they belonged and whether or not they held an executive position within the organization. Belonging to an organization was scored as 1; holding an executive position in an organization or holding a municipal position was scored as 2. Any person who received a score of 4 or higher was categorized as a high community participant, whereas a person who received a score below 4 was categorized as a low participant. Years of residence were grouped into three categories 0-10, 10-20, and 20+.

It was judged important to develop a separate category of persons who were considered to be "influentials" in the community. The question in the interview: "Name five individuals who have the most influence in this community", was used to identify influentials. Any person named by more than three respondents was included in a list of "influentials", and each was then approached for an interview. The list of "influentials" included persons holding leadership positions in the community, persons whose opinions on community matters were held in high esteem, persons considered "knowledgeables", and persons holding high prestige in the community. It is, therefore, possible to compare the assessments of community "influentials" with those assessments held by the respondents from the various occupational segments of the community, and also, to determine the degree to which such "influentials" represent the community's assessments.[30]

COMPLETE LIST OF STRUCTURAL VARIABLES USED BY THE C.A.S.
(Unity, Saskatchewan, 1975)

Occupations:
1. farmers
2. farmwives
3. housewives
4. unskilled
5. skilled
6. clerical and sales
7. proprietors, officials, managers
8. semi-professionals and professionals

Retired

Influentials (Non-Influentials)

Community Participation: (High) (Low)

Age:
1. 20-29
2. 30-39
3. 40-49
4. 50-59
5. 60-69
6. 70 +

---

[30] For literature relative to the study of community elites, leaders, influentials, etc. see: (Warner, W. Lloyd and Lunt, Paul, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, Yale University Press, 1941). Charles Kadushin, "Power, Influence and Social Circles: A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Merks", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33, No. 5, 1968, pp. 685-699; E. Laumann, L. Verbrugge, F. Pappi, "A Causal Modelling Approach to the Study of a Community Elite's Influence Structure", *Am. Soc. Rev*., Vol. 39, 1974, pp. 162-174; James Preston, "The Search for Community Leaders: A Re-examination of the Reputational Technique", *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 39, 1969, pp. 30-47; E. Laumann & F. Pappi, "New Directions in the Study of Community Elites", *Am. Soc. Rev*., Vol. 38, 1973, pp. 212-230.

Sex: (Male) (Female)

Religion: (Anglican) (United Church) (Roman Catholic) (Other)

Ethnicity: (British Isles) (German) (Other)

Years of Residence in Community:

1. 0-10
2. 10-20
3. 20+

High School Students

VARIABLES RELATED TO STRUCTURAL VARIABLES WHICH ARE PROBED BY THE C.A.S.:

1. Home ownership
2. How long the person has held their present job
3. Education
4. Income
5. Difficulty in obtaining loans

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The interview technique is used to gather C.A.S. data. The interview has a degree of flexibility which is useful when dealing with the many diverse segments of a community population. Questions may be rephrased by the interviewer to ensure that the respondent has understood what is being asked; definitions and explanations can be made clear; open ended questions can be followed up.

The C.A.S. interview schedule utilizes both open ended questions and a variety of "fixed" questions. Fixed questions can be composed or structured in a number of ways: the respondent may be asked to supply specific information (To what organization do you belong?); the respondent may be asked a question that has a number of possible responses (In what size town would you prefer to live: farm, town under 500 population, etc.); or the respondent may be asked to "scale" his response to a question (Do you enjoy your work? (absolutely not) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (absolutely yes)). In the C.A.S., most attitudinal questions are "scaled" questions. The use of the scale allows the respondent to choose his response within a range of possibilities and intensities. The lowest number always represents the absolutely negative response and the highest number represents the absolutely positive response. The middle of the scale, 4, is considered "neutral".

The C.A.S. interview schedule was developed in three phases. Initially, questions were collected which had been used in research having a similar orientation to the C.A.S. These sources primarily included: "Social & Economic Impact Study of the Lake Winnipeg Churchill-Nelson Rivers Hydro Development",[31] and Barriers to Population Mobility by Jane Abramson, 1968.[32] In the second phase, the research staff compiled sets of questions which were judged relevant to the purpose of evaluating community assessments. These included questions suggested by relevant literature as well as by experts. Questions related to community differentiation and structure were also compiled during this phase.

In the third phase, the interview schedule was tested on students in two classes at the University of Saskatchewan, and revised on the basis of the student responses. The revised version of the interview schedule was administered to the sample population in the target community. The purpose of this community pretest was to determine which of the variables would be significant. The analysis of the variables covered in the pretest schedule has allowed the researchers to compile a simplified interview schedule including only those variables found to be of significance. The final schedule is the product of revisions made both on recommendations of the research staff in "de-briefing" sessions held after all the interviews were completed, and from the information gained through computer analysis of the data.

---

[31] "Social and Economic Impact Study of the Lake Winnipeg Churchill-Nelson Rivers Hydro Development", op.cit., 1974.

[32] Jane A. Abramson, Barriers to Population Mobility, Canadian Centre for Community Studies, Saskatoon, 1968, reprinted DREE, Ottawa, 1970.

The C.A.S. schedule is designed to be applicable to any small community. However, in each community it will need to be modified by adding questions which may be of particular importance to that community. For example, the section concerned with "farmers" might be replaced with a section concerned with other specific groups such as native people, government employees, loggers, etc.. The category, "farmers", however, should not be replaced by another occupational category, since all occupational categories are included in the occupational breakdown. Added questions should replicate the form of existing questions within the schedule in order to avoid difficulties in analysis.

HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

Sampling the high school students may present special difficulties for the community researcher. In a small high school it may be possible to interview every student; however this is not feasible in a large school, nor always in a small school. Access to the students must be gained through school officials who often will specify the time and circumstances during which the students may be interviewed, if at all. A questionnaire was developed which could be distributed by school officials. The questionnaire is less satisfactory than the interview; however, it can generate meaningful data about the attitudes and assessments of the students.

The C.A.S. High School Questionnaire is designed in the same manner as the interview schedule, but modified for this particular group. The C.A.S. is interested in probing student attitudes about career plans, the types of social environments they hope to live in, plans for marriage and children, whether or not they plan to stay within the community, leave with hopes of returning or leave for good.

THE RESEARCH TEAM

It is essential that the interviews be conducted and recorded by people who are trained in the art of administering interviews and people who understand the purpose for which the interviewing is being done. It seems most necessary that the interviewers play a significant part at each stage in applying the C.A.S.. Several staff sessions should be devoted to discussion of objectives, interviewing techniques, and developing sensitivity to the target community.

The interviewers should live in the community during the interviewing period. They should immerse themselves as much as possible in the life of the community and keep a daily journal during the time they are in the community. Journals can be very important because they contain information which provide a basis for interpreting statistically analyzed data from the interviews and the high school questionnaires. Since the researchers must rely upon the ability of the interviewers to perceive and record perceptions which will aid in interpreting data, the need for trained and qualified personnel is most vital.

This memo from the principal investigator was given to the interviewers at the time they moved into Unity, Saskatchewan:

As we have discussed, I would like you to keep a journal as an outsider with empathy (due to your own personal experience in small towns) and intense interest to learn about the people of Unity, Saskatchewan. You must be concerned about where these people are at...where they think they've been...where they would like to go as a community. Would they be willing to exert effort to make their lives and the life of the community they call "home town" more in the future as they would want it to become? We are looking for directions and dimensions of the future of these people as they would like it to be.

You must live with these people; trying to "get off" on what they "get off" on, especially in recreation, the night-on-the-town, the activities, the life styles, etc.. You probably won't be able to live it but you must sense it...or feel it...be aware of it...sensitive. The effort is to see beyond the individuals to the "people" they constitute. In any case, remember, you are surrounded by both in Unity, Saskatchewan. You must then compose your insights in such a way that you can explain what you have perceived to others....try to distinguish between what it was you saw and what you have judged it to be.

Some of the ideas we have tossed around as events to be noticed include... in the vaguest sort of order:

Important Conversations

Note:
- themes/opinions/moral values/unwritten rules
- outlook of youth, others (hopes, expectations, dreams)
- sense of pride...in home, hobby, swimming pool, town, self, family, horse, parks
- what are the good things?
- optimism scale on crops
- talk to clergy, police, etc.

Important Observations

Note:
- activities...participate if you like it!!
  What is done on weekends?
  What is done on the night-on-the-town?
  What entertainment...of: Young couples
  Youth
  Middle-aged couples
  The older people
  What is there to see and do?
  How do men and women socialize?

Blend in even though you stand out! If you feel at home they will feel at home with you.

Immediately after conducting the interviews in the community, the interviewers should spend time in a de-briefing session with the principal investigator and analysis staff, "talking through" the interview schedule, starting with the first question and discussing the meaning, significance, reactions, etc. which were perceived by the interviewers when administering the instruments. Judgments on the value and significance of each question in understanding the people's views and assessments should be requested from each interviewer. The sessions should be taped and reproduced in written form in order to be used during analysis.

ENTRANCE INTO THE COMMUNITY

An ad should be placed in the local newspaper before the interview team enters the community. The ad should explain the purpose of the research and ask community residents to assist the researchers by being willing to be interviewed if approached. It was found that this method of introduction into the community was the single most important aid in gaining the cooperation of the residents. The newspaper ad should be published again midway through the interviewing period. Below is the ad which was used to introduce the town of Unity, Saskatchewan, to the research team developing the C.A.S.. The ad should, of course, be aimed specifically at informing the population of the specific purpose for which the C.A.S. is being applied.

> U OF S RESEARCHERS PICK
> UNITY FOR RESEARCH CENTRE
>
> On June fifteenth a group of social science researchers from the University of Saskatchewan (Saskatoon) will be moving into the community of Unity. The group is in the process of developing a means of supplying reliable community input into a decision making related to economic expansion and resource development as these affect communities. The assumption behind the development of what we are terming a 'Community Assessment System' is that communities themselves should be allowed to define some limits witiin which development affecting their community.

> The research group will live in Unity for one month. During that time we hope to interview and talk with as many people as possible about their feelings and hopes for the future of the community as well as their own future within the community. Unity has been chosen because of many factors to be the 'research site'.
>
> Most important is the reputation of the community as being dynamic and foreward looking. The project is being carried out under the direction of Dr. Alan Haynes, Sociology Department, University of Saskatchewan. We would like to thank the community in advance for the time and cooperation which will be necessary if the project is to be successful.
>
> (The Northwest Herald (Unity, Saskatchewan) Wednesday, June 11, 1975, Vol. 69, No. 24).

INTERVIEWING PROCEDURE

People whose names have been selected from the enumeration lists (following procedures outlined above) should be contacted by telephone and appointments made to conduct interviews. The telephone contact should be made by a female, except for the "influentials" who should be contacted by the prinicipal investigator. The response rate seems to be higher if a female requests the appointment than if a male makes the initial contact.[33] The person making the telephone contact should as briefly as possible explain the purpose of the interview and schedule the interview at the convenience of each respondent. It was found that because of time constraints it was better to conduct the interviews with representatives of various categories of the entire sample simultaneously. Housewives and retired people can most conveniently be interviewed during the day, whereas people who are employed are usually available only during evenings. Proprietors seemed to find it most convenient to be interviewed during business hours.

---

[33] Conversation with Marvin Brown, Head, Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, 1975.

It was found most informative to the interviewers to conduct interviews with proprietors during midmorning or midafternoon, if possible during the "coffee break". In many small communities proprietors gather in one or more locations to have coffee together and discuss topics of mutual concern. For the interviewer to be invited into this "institution" can be most enlightening and information can be gathered which may be of significant importance at the later stage of data analysis. Such information should be recorded in the interviewer's journal. In many communities, the institution of "Coffee Row" may be diminishing in importance as larger stores and enterprises establish coffee breaks for their own employees. However, the interviewers should try to identify as early as possible those informal institutions within the community where information and opinions are exchanged on topics having community relevance.

It cannot be overstressed that in order to gather reliable information the interview schedule must be administered and recorded by personnel trained in the art and techniques of interviewing. Simply using the schedule will not in itself generate objective or reliable data. It is essential also that the interviewing staff maintain continuing dialogue among themselves during the interviewing period in order to exchange information learned in the process of administering the interview schedule in the community. Only in this way can the schedule be meaningfully and knowingly administered, skillfully interpreted to the respondents, explained and recorded. This procedure must be followed by each interviewer in order to ensure uniformity without distortion in administering the schedule. Recent studies seem to indicate that the bias introduced by trained interviewers is negligible in gathering subjective data.[34]

A friendly informal atmosphere must be established between interviewer and respondent. The purpose of the interview should be explained in more specific detail than when the interview appointment is arranged by telephone. It was found that giving the respondent a copy of the interview schedule aided them in visualizing the nature of each question and aided the interviewers in administering scaled and "fixed" questions.

The frame of reference around which the conversation is to evolve is established by the schedule. It should "direct" the conversation except when open ended questions invite the respondent to follow his own direction. It is most important that respondents be interviewed alone if it is possible. The interviewer must have the skill to get the conversation back on course when the fruitfulness of a topic comes to an end and to discern the true thoughts of the respondent in relation to each topic covered. This ability is most important in the few cases in which it is not possible to interview the respondent alone. The interviewer must be genuinely interested in the attitudes of the respondent, yet must remain neutral in order not to influence the expression of assessments by the respondents. The interviewer must assess the level of comprehensions and directions whenever necessary. At times, the questions must be reworded by the interviewer in order to get at the real attitudes and feelings of the respondents. When recording, the interviewer must make sure to paraphrase in such a way that the significance and meaning will not be distorted and can be understood by those who will process the interview schedules.

---

[34] Herbert Hyman, Interviewing in Social Research, University of Chicago Press, 1975. Also see: Gene F. Summers and Andre D. Hamonds, "Toward a paradigm respondent bias in survey research", Sociological Quarterly, 10: 113-121, 1969).

Questions with "fixed" answers are pre-coded on a separate coding sheet. The coding of open ended questions must be done after the interview is completed and, thus, authentic paraphrasing is absolutely necessary. Each interview schedule and coding sheet should be inspected immediately after the interview for errors and additional comments by the interviewers, in order to make subsequent interpretation as easy and precise as possible.

ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Data should be coded on coding sheets after each interview is completed. The primary purpose of the coding sheet is to prepare the data for computer analysis. Those responses which are not to be analyzed by computer, particularly the open-ended questions, should be given identifying numbers and recorded in a catalogue. Frequencies for some questions, e.g., open-ended, can be aggregated by hand.

Most attitude questions are answered on seven-point scales that may be treated as interval scales for the purposes of analysis. Some of the attitude questions evoke "Yes/Sometimes/No" or "Yes/Maybe/No" responses. The researcher must decide if an interval scale can be assumed. After having made a frequency count of the Unity data, "Yes" was coded as 1) "No" as 0 and the middle term as 0. This scaling procedure allowed all of the attitudinal questions to be used in the factor analysis. If the researcher decides not to treat the non-scaled questions as translatable into interval scales, then only the seven-point scaled questions can be included in the factor analysis.

Data on structural variables should be coded as nominal level data: occupational, religious and ethnic groups. By coding the structural variables in this manner, it is possible to calculate the mean score of each group on each attitudinal variable. Also, the standard deviations for each group can be calculated. These indicate the extent of variation within the group relative to the particular attitude. An analysis of variance can be used to determine if the attitude means of the structural groups are significantly different. It would be useful to use a two-way analysis of variance, that is, to study differences in the attitude means for one structural variable while controlling for another. This procedure could not be followed in the Unity study because there were too few cases. If two-way analysis of variance is not possible, the cross tabulation of the structural variables and their levels of significance should be reported.

The questionnaire is designed to collect information about many attitude variables. The significance of these variables, their interrelationships with each other and with the structural variables need to be determined in a reasonably parsimonious fashion; simply recording the raw data would obscure the interrelationships. Factor analysis can be used to group attitude variables into a number of distinctive factors.[35] Not all of the attitude variables probed by the C.A.S. can be entered into a factor analysis. The sample size and the number of degrees of freedom relative to the total number of variables limit the number of variables that can be used. Because the results of factor analysis tend to be influenced by the nature and number of variables, only the most important variables are included in the factor analysis. The criteria used to determine the variables to be included in the analysis are: 1) after interviewing is complete, the researcher must specify, a priori, those variables that he judges will be most significant for ascertaining the community's attitudes; and 2) variables should be included which are pertinent to specific research objectives.

---

[35] For discussion of factor analysis see: Dennis Child, The Essentials of Factor Analysis, Holt, Rinehart & Winston Ltd, 1970; J. Scott Armstrong and Peer Soelberg, "On the Interpretation of Factor Analysis", Psychological Bulletin, 1968, Vol. 70, No. 5, 361-364.

In the Unity study, the sixty most important variables (determined by a priori criteria) were factor-analyzed. Because the results of factor analysis are influenced by the number of variables used, the procedure was applied to the Unity data three times, with sixty variables, with fifty-nine variables and with fifty-eight variables. When the results were compared, the factors extracted were internally consistent since variables within each factor had similar loadings. However, the relative importance of the different factors varied with each factor analysis.[36] Consequently, it was determined to group the factors on the basis of their similarity and consistency. These factor groupings will be referred to as "Assessment Sets". In general, the important factors are only those with eigenvalues higher than 1.[37]

Equimax rotation was used on the Unity data. Equimax is considered to be a compromise between varimax and quartimax rotations.[38] Dennis Child[39] provides a formula for determining the levels of significance of the factor loadings for each variable. The results of the Unity study are reported for 1% and 5% levels of significance. Most attention is paid to the 1% levels of significance. When the factor analysis is complete, the factor scores of each respondent are calculated for each of the seventeen factors.[40]

---

[36] It is likely that a larger sample size would result in a more stable ordering of the factors.

[37] See Child, op. cit. p. 43.

[38] Norman Nie et al, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 97.

[39] Child, op. cit., p. 97.

The analysis of variance both of the factor scores and of the attitude variables is reported. The factor analysis and the analysis of variance of the factor scores provide an extremely useful way to summarize, structure and order the large amount of information collected.[41]

The attitudinal factors require interpretation since they are composed of particular attitudes which cluster together on the basis of how responses of the sample population correlate. The reliability of the interpretation rests upon the ability of the researcher to comprehend the significance of the variable loadings upon each of the factors. This must be done by relying upon observation and understanding gained from actually conducting the investigation. The journals and notes kept by the interviewers (and those who are to interpret the information), as well as the de-briefing sessions held immediately after the interviewing is completed, are a necessary component in the reliable interpretation of the factors.

The reliability of interpretations of the factors produced by the C.A.S. through factor analysis rests upon two elements, a priori analysis and an understanding by the researcher of attitudes within the community under study. In the Unity study, it was postulated before factor analysis was applied that attitudes would cluster in the following ways: future change orientations, community social environment, "quality of life", agricultural and service development, population growth, mobility, occupational needs. On the whole, the results of factor analysis bore out these predictions. The predictions were based upon previous findings suggested in the literature as well as on "educated" hunches. Such an *a priori* specification of a model provides an objective benchmark for reliability.

---

[40] See Nie, et al, op. cit., p. 489.

[41] The researcher should be familiar with the treatment of factor analysis by Lae-On Kim in Nie, et al, op. cit., pp. 468-514.

C.A.S. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A. COMMUNITY ASSESSMENTS

1. How many years have you lived in this community:
   1) less than one year
   2) 1-4 years
   3) 5-9 years
   4) 10-14 years
   5) 15-19 years
   6) 20-24 years
   7) 25 + years

2. How many of the following types of organizations are you presently active in: association(s), civic group(s), church group(s) [do not include religious affiliation] trade union(s). How many:_________

3. In how many of the above organizations do you presently hold an official position (elected/appointed): How many: ________

4. Do you presently hold an official position (elected/appointed) in either the municipal or local rural government: 1) Yes [Positions of particular local importance could be added here, e.g., Band Council]
   2) No

5. How do you most often learn about local community news and events: (Check five)

1. Local newspaper ____
2. Regional newspaper ____
3. Radio ____
4. Television ____
5. Friends ____
6. Neighbours ____
7. Social Acquaintances ____
8. Business Acquaintances ____
9. Formal meetings ____
10. Other _________________ ____

6. How do you feel about living in this community:

(Dislike very much) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Like very much) Don't know
(neutral)

7. Are you interested in moving away from this community at the present time:

(Very uninterested) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very interested) Don't know
(neutral)

8. Do you think you could raise your material standard of living if you moved away from this community:

(Absolutely not) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Absolutely yes) Don't know
(same)

9. In your opinion is it realistic for graduating high school students to remain in this community:

(Very unrealistic) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very realistic) Don't know
(neutral)

10. Would you like to see more young people stay in this community after graduating from high school:

No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

11. Size of community you would prefer to live in:

1) farm
2) under 499 population
3) 500-999
4) 1,000-1,499
5) 1,500-1,999
6) 2,000-2,499
7) 2,500-2,999
8) 3,000-3,499
9) 4,000-4,499
10) 4,500-4,999
11) 5,000-9,999
12) 10,000-14,999
13) 15,000-19,999
14) 20,000-49,999
15) 50,000-99,999
16) 100,000 +

12. What is the social atmosphere of this community:

(Very unfriendly) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very friendly) Don't know
(neutral)

13. Is "friendliness" in this community:

(Much more in past) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more friendly now) Don't know
(same)

14. During the year do the adults of this community get together:

No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

15. Are there many people of different backgrounds who live in this community:

No: 1
Some: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

16. Are there many people in this community living different lifestyles:

No: 1
Some: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

17. Do people in this community feel they have more in common that differences:

No: 1
Some: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

18. Do people in this community place more value on their family privacy than on being in touch with neighbours:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

19. Do people often share their personal troubles and ask help from neighbours:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

20. When someone has something on his/her mind that is bothering him/her are neighbours willing to help:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

21. If a bill collector came around asking about a neighbour, would people in this community refuse to give out any information:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

22. Are people in this community often active in groups outside this community:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

23. Are newcomers easily accepted into this community:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

24. Are there many people who move in and out of this community:

1 - No: 1
2 - Sometimes: 2
3 - Yes: 3
Don't know

25. How do you feel about people living in this community only on weekends or for short periods of time during the year (eg. summer cottages, etc.):

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

26. In general, what do you think of the future of this community as compared to the present:

(Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know
(same)

27. What reasons can you give for thinking the future of this community will be "good":

1. ____

2. ____

3. ____

28. What reasons can you give for thinking the future of this community will be "poor":

1. ____

2. ____

3. ____

29. What do you think your personal future in this community will be compared to the present:

(Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know
(same)

30. What reasons can you give for thinking your future in this community may be "good":

1.____

2.____

3.____

31. What reasons can you give for thinking your future in this community may be "poor":

1.____

2.____

3.____

32. Is your present housing:

(Much less than adequate for your needs) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more than adequate for your needs)
(adequate)
Don't know

33. Is having close relatives living nearby important to you:

(Very important) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very important) Don't know
(neutral)

34. What activities do you spend most of your leisure time doing:

In summer:	In winter:
1.________________________	1.______________________________
2.________________________	2.______________________________
3.________________________	3.______________________________
4.________________________	4.______________________________

35. What do you think of the natural surroundings of this community:

(Very unattractive) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very attractive) Don't know
(neutral)

36. What do you think of the appearance of this community:

(Very unattractive) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very attractive) Don't know
(neutral)

37. How do you feel about tourists visiting this region:

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

38. How do you think tourism affects the economy of this community:

(Large financial loss to community) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Large financial gain to community) Don't know
(no effect)

39. If development and/or advertisement were to occur, what might attract more tourists to this region:

1.____

2.____

3.____

40. How do you think the material standard of living in the next ten years will compare to that of the past ten years:

(Will be much worse) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Will be much better) Don't know
(same)

41. List some ways you think the material standard of living will be better or worse:

1. ____

2. ____

3. ____

4. ____

42. How do you think the "quality of life" in the next ten years will compare to the past ten years:

(Will be much worse) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Will be much better) Don't know
(same)

43. List some ways you think the "quality of life" will be better or worse:

1. ____

2. ____

3. ____

4. ____

44. Do you think the population of this community is growing:

(Substantially declining) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Substantially growing) Don't know
(same)

45. How would you like to see the population of this community change:

(Substantially decline) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Substantially grow) Don't know
(same)

46. If the population of this community were to grow are there any types of people you would NOT like to have move into the community:

1. ____________________

2. ____________________

3. ____________________

4. ____________________

5. No

6. Don't know

47. How much shopping does your family (or you) do in this community:

1. None
2. 25%
3. 50%
4. 75%
5. Almost everything

48. What kinds of items do you buy outside of this community:

1.____________________________ 2.______________________________

3.____________________________ 4.______________________________

49. If your family (or you) shop outside of this community, where do you primarily do your shopping:

1.________________________ 2.___________________________ 3._____________________________

a) Why?

50. What businesses or services are NOT presently available in this community which you would like to see established:

1.________________________________ Available in past: Yes/No/Don't know

1.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing this business or service:
Yes/No/No opinion

1.b. If yes: loan/grant

2.________________________________ Available in past: Yes/No/Don't know

2.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing this business or service:
Yes/No/No opinion

2.b. If yes: loan/grant

3.________________________________ Available in past: Yes/No/Don't know

3.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing this business or service:
Yes/No/No opinion

3.b. If yes: loan/grant

4. None

5. Don't know

51. What businesses or services presently available in this community should be improved?

1.________________________________ How ____

1.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

1.b. If yes: loan/grant

2. ________________________________ How ____

2.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

2.b. If yes: loan/grant

51. cont'd.

3.______________________________ How ____

3.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

3.b. If yes: loan/grant

4. None

5. Don't know

52. What community activities or programs would you like to see offered in this community which are NOT available at present:

1.____ Available in Past: Yes/No/Don't know

1.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing: Yes/No/Don't know

1.b. If yes: loan/grant.

2.____ Available in Past: Yes/No/Don't know

2.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing: Yes/No/Don't know

2.b. If yes: loan/grant

3.____ Available in Past: Yes/No/Don't know

3.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in establishing: Yes/No/Don't know

3.b. If yes: loan/grant

4. None

5. Don't know

53. What community activities or programs presently available in this community should be improved:

1.____ How ____

1.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

1.b. If yes: loan/grant

2.____ How ____

2.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

53. cont'd.

2.b. If yes: loan/grant

3.______________________________________ How ____

3.a. Should the Federal or Provincial government aid in improving: Yes/No/Don't know

3.b. If yes: loan/grant

4. None

5. Don't know

54. In which of the following types of jobs would you like to see job opportunities increased in this community:

1. Unskilled: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

1a. Why:

2. Semiskilled: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

2a. Why.

3. Skilled: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

3a. Why:

4. Clerical: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

4a. Why:

5. Management: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

5a. Why:

54. Cont'd.

6. Sales: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

   6a. Why:

7. Semi Professional: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

   7a. Why:

8. Professional: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

   8a. Why:

9. Proprietors: very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 very much like Don't know

   9a. Why:

55. In what local industries, businesses, etc., if any, is a shortage of labour most serious:

1 ____________________

2 ____________________

3 ____________________

4 ____________________

5 ____________________

56. In which of the following areas would you like to see expansion and/or development take place in this community:

1) Mining: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

2) Farming: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

3) Manufacturing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

4) Retail/Wholesale trade: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

5) Public Administration: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

6) Service Institutions: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(eg. hospitals, schools, etc.)

7) Processing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

8) Logging: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

9) Fishing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

10) Transportation: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

11) Construction: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

12) Finance and Real Estate: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

13) Services: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know

57. If the tax base of this community were substantially altered, would you be willing to pay more property taxes:

1. No
2. 25% more
3. 50% more
4. 75% more
5. 100% more
6. 150% more
7. 200% more

58. To your knowledge, has the local civic government attempted to stimulate growth in this community during the past five years:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

59. To your knowledge, has the local Board of Trade attempted to stimulate growth in this community:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

60. To your knowledge, has the Provincial Government (or any Provincial agency) attempted to stimulate growth in this community:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

61. To your knowledge, has the Federal Government (or any Federal agency) attempted to stimulate growth in this community:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

62. What groups (local, Provincial, Federal) have succeeded in stimulating growth in this community:

1)_______________________________________

2)_______________________________________

3)_______________________________________

4)_______________________________________

5) None

6) Don't know

63. To what extent do you think the improvement and expansion of railroad services is necessary for the development of this community:

1) is not necessary--community could still decline
2) is not necessary--community would stay about the same
3) is somewhat necessary
4) is absolutely necessary
5) don't know

64. To what extent do you think the improvement and expansion of airport facilities is necessary for the development of this community:

1) is not necessary--community could still decline
2) is not necessary--community would stay about the same
3) is somewhat necessary
4) is absolutely necessary
5) don't know

65. To what extent do you think the improvement and expansion of highways is necessary for the development of this community:

1) is not necessary--community could still decline
2) is not necessary--community would stay about the same
3) is somewhat necessary
4) is absolutely necessary
5) don't know

66. To what extent do you think the improvement and expansion of regular trucking and bus service are necessary for the development of this community:

1) is not necessary--community could still decline
2) is not necessary--community would stay about the same
3) is somewhat necessary
4) is absolutely necessary
5) don't know

67. Name five individuals who have the most influence in this community: [must give name not position]

1)______________________ Occupation______________________
2)______________________ Occupation______________________
3)______________________ Occupation______________________
4)______________________ Occupation______________________
5)______________________ Occupation______________________

68. In your opinion what organizations and/or associations have the most influence in this community:

1.______________________
2.______________________
3.______________________
4.______________________
5.______________________

69. In order of importance, identify six specific community problems and/or issues of current concern:

1. ______________________________ 4. ______________________________

2. ______________________________ 5. ______________________________

3. ______________________________ 6. ______________________________

70. If economic expansion and/or development was occurring in this community and you thought it would have detrimental effects on the community, what action would you be willing to take:

1) Publish newsletter or distribute handouts:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
2) Conduct door-to-door campaigns:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
3) Advertise in mass media:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
4) Contact neighbours:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
5) Contact community organizations:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
6) Form "grass-roots" groups:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
7) Make representations to town council:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know
8) None:	1. Yes	2. Maybe	3. No	Don't know

71. What are the most important groups of people from outside this community you think should be most helpful in solving community problems: (check five)

Scientists
Engineers
Businessmen
Teachers
Politicians
Labour
Sociologists
Economists
Planners
Lawyers
Bankers
Government agency representatives
Social Workers
Psychologists

72. Are you concerned about Canada running out of some resources within the next ten years:

No: 1
Maybe: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

73. Who should make decisions in the following areas:
(local control=town council and/or local organizations and people)

1) If a new business which would compete with already existing local enterprises were to be established:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(Same as present)

2) If policies are made which affect the growth or decline of the population of this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as present)

3) If policies are made which affect transportation and freight rates affecting this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as present)

4) When Provincially or Federally financed recreation areas are developed in or near this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as present)

5) When policies are made affecting pollution control in this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as present)

73. Cont'd

6) When policies are made regarding the use of land in and around this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as
present)

7) If changes are to be made in the local schools:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control) Don't know
(same as
present)

74. Which of the following government agencies and projects are you familiar with:

1) Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission: Yes/No
2) Canada Manpower Center: Yes/No
3) S.G.I.O.: Familiar with: Yes/No
4) Saskatchewan Land Bank: Yes/No
5) Saskatchewan Research Council: Yes/No
6) Workmen's Compensation Board: Yes/No
7) Advisory Council on Grain Crops: Yes/No
8) Saskatchewan Housing Corporation: Yes/No
9) Department of Northern Saskatchewan: Yes/No
10) Senior Citizens Commission: Yes/No
11) A.R.D.A. (Agricultural and Rural Development Act): Yes/No
12) P.F.R.A. (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act): Yes/No
13) Information Canada: Yes/No
14) Department of Veteran's Affairs: Yes/No
15) U.I.C. (Unemployment Insurance Commission): Yes/No
16) Department of Indian Affairs: Yes/No

74. Cont'd

17) Department of Municipal Affairs: 1) Yes 2) No

18) Local Government Board: 1) Yes 2) No

75. Do you think in general people working in government agencies treat you fairly and justly:

No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

B. OCCUPATION

76. Primary (income earning) occupation: ________________________ Position ____________________________

76a. Primary occupation: 1) Full time 2) Part time 3) Seasonal 4) Temporary

76b. Are you a housewife: 1) Yes 2) No

1) If yes, do you have employment outside the home: 1) Yes 2) No
2) If yes, 1) Full time 2) Part time 3) Seasonal 4) Temporary

76c. Check the appropriate occupational sector in which you are employed:

1. Mining
2. Farming
3. Manufacturing
4. Retail/Wholesale trade
5. Public administration
6. Service institutions
7. Processing
8. Logging
9. Fishing
10. Transportation
11. Construction
12. Finance, real estate
13. Services
14. Home

77. Do you have a second job: 1. Yes 2) No

77a. If yes, 1) Full time 2) Part time 3) Seasonal 4) Temporary

77b. Job description ______________________________

78. If married, is your spouse employed: 1) Yes 2) No

78a. If yes: 1) Full time 2) Part time 3) Seasonal 4) Temporary

78b. His/her employment: ____________________ Position: __________________________

79. Are you:
1. Retired
2. Disabled
3. Unemployed

80. How long have you been at your present job (primary occupation):

1. Less than one year
2. 1 - 4 years
3. 5 - 9 years
4. 10 - 14 years
5. 15 - 19 years
6. 20 - 24 years
7. 25 years or more.

81. Is your place or area of work in a community(s) other than this community: 1) Yes 2) No

81a. If yes. how many miles do you commute to work:
1. 0 - 9 miles
2. 10 - 19 miles
3. 20 + miles

82. Do you enjoy your work:

(Absolutely not) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Absolutely yes) Don't know
(neutral)

83. Would you like a different occupation: No: 1
Maybe: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

83a. What:____

84. Would you consider an up-grading program for advancement in your present occupation:

No: 1
Maybe: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

Offer depends on ____

85. What do you think about Farmer's Associations:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very unfavourable) Don't know
(neutral)

86. What do you think about Business Associations:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

86. What do you think about trade unions:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

88. What do you think about the present local town council:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

89. What do you think about the government creating jobs in a community for people of the community who cannot find work:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

90. What do you think about Family Allowance Payments:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

91. What do you think about Unemployment Insurance:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

92. What do you think about people receiving Social Assistance:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

93. What do you think about a Guaranteed Annual Income:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know
(neutral)

94. In this community, does the ethnic group to which a person belongs play a role in hiring practices:

No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

94a. Can you mention any particular groups affected:

1.____________________________

2.____________________________

3.____________________________

95. In this community, does the age of a person play a role in hiring practices:

No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

95a. What Role?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

96. Age: ____

97. Sex: 1) Male   2) Female

98. Marital Status:
1. Single
2. Married
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed

99. Total number of dependent children living at home: ____________

Ages:	1. Under 6	Number: __________
	2. 6 - 12	Number: __________
	3. 13 - 18	Number: __________
	4. 18 +	Number: __________

100. Number of children attending public school: ________

101. Number of children attending separate school: _________

102. Ethnic Origins:

1) British Isles
2) French
3) Australian
4) Chinese
5) Czech
6) Finnish
7) German
8) Hungarian
9) Italian
10) Japanese
11) Jewish
12) Native Status Indian
13) Native Non-Status Indian
14) Metis
15) Negro
16) Netherlands
17) Polish
18) Russian
19) Scandinavian
20) Slovak
21) Ukrainian
22) West Indian
23) Other: ______________________________

103. Religious Affiliation:

1) Adventist
2) Anglical
3) Baptist
4) Buddhist
5) Christian Missionary Alliance
6) Christian Reformed
7) Churches of Christ, Disciples
8) Greek Orthodox
9) Hutterite
10) Jehovah's Wittnesses
11) Jewish
12) Lutheran
13) Mennonite
14) Latter Day Saint (Mormon)
15) Pentecostal
16) Presbyterian
17) Roman Catholic
18) Salvation Army
19) Ukrainian Catholic
20) United Church
21) Other: ______________________________ ______
22) No Religion
23) No Religious Affiliation

104. Last grade of school completed: (circle)

1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8--9--10--11--12

13--14--15--16 (college)

17--18--19--20-- (post graduate)

105. Post-secondary education or special occupational training you have completed:

a) Type of program: ______________________________

b) Length of time you were in program: ______________________

c) Certificate or degree obtained: ________________________

d) Year graduated: __________

106. Annual family income

1. Under 1,999
2. 2,000 - 4,999
3. 5,000 - 7,999
4. 8,000 - 9,999
5. 10,000 - 14,999
6. 15,000 - 19,999
7. 20,000 - 24,999
8. 25,000 +

107. Present Annual Personal Income (Gross):

1. Under 1,999
2. 2,000 - 4,999
3. 5,000 - 7,999
4. 8,000 - 9,999
5. 10,000 - 14,999
6. 15,000 - 19,999
7. 20,000 - 24,999
8. 25,000 +

108. Do you presently have investments in businesses, companies, farms, etc. in this community: 1) Yes 2) No

109. Do you presently have investments in businesses, companies, farms, etc. in communities other than this community: 1) Yes 2) No

110. Checklist of investments:

1. Registered Retirement Savings - 1) Yes 2) No
2. Private Life Insurance - 1) Yes 2) No
3. Private Pension Plan - 1) Yes 2) No
4. Savings (at least the equivalent of one month's income) - 1) Yes 2) No
5. Bonds - 1) Yes 2) No
6. Other: ______________________

111. Do you think that your present net income is adequate for your needs:

(Less than adequate) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (More than adequate)
(adequate)

112. Do you own your own home: 1) Yes 2) Mortgaged 3) No

113. Do you rent the home you live in: 1) Yes 2) No

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED FARMERS AND RANCHERS

1. Total quarter sections owned: ____________________

2. Total quarter sections operated: ______________________

3. Principle cash product: __________________
   3a. If cattle or livestock: Number of head: ____________________

4. Secondary cash product: ___________________
   4a. If cattle or livestock: Number of head: _________________

5. Do you live on your acreage: Yes/No/Seasonally

6. Do you do your own farming: Yes/No

6a. If no, who works your farm: 1. Lease farm
2. Hire someone to work farm
3. Other: ______________________________

7. How many people do you employ: ______________________________

8. Is there a shortage of farm labour in this community: No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

8a. If yes, specify types needed: ______________________________

8b. If yes, do you lose money because of lack of labour: No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

8c. If yes, how do you hire farm labour: ______________________________

9. From whom do you seek advice most frequently about your farm: (check two)

1) Friends/relatives
2) Neighbours
3) Company representatives
4) Media (Radio/T.V., etc.)
5) Government/University Extension Services
6) Veterinarians
7) Other____________________________________

10. What do you think of cooperative farms:

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

10a. Why:

11. What do you think of food processing companies owning farm land:

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

11a. Why:

12. What do you think of government owning farm land:

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

12a. Why:

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED--NOT FARMERS

1. Type of business (Principle): ______________________________

2. Do you run your own business: Yes/No

2a. If no, who runs your business: 1. Lease
2. Hire someone to run
3. Other: ____________________

3. How many people do you employ: ____________________

4. Is there a labour shortage in this community for your business: No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

4a. If yes, specify types needed: ______________________________

4b. If yes, do you lose business or money because of lack of available labour:
No: 1
Sometimes: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

4c. If yes, how do you hire labour: ______________________________

5. At the present time, could this community absorb another business of the same type as yours:

No: 1
Maybe: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

5a. If no, how much larger (population) would the community have to be (or trade area) to absorb a business of the same type as yours: ______________________

5b. What is your volume of sales per annum: ______________________

5c. Where is your clientele from:

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________

5d. How large an area do you service: ______________________________

5e. Do you give your clients any more or less service than they would get in a larger center:

Considerably less service 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 Considerably more service

5f. Elaborate

6. From whom do you seek advice most frequently about your business: (check two)

1) Friends/relatives ____
2) People in the same or related business ____
3) Company representatives ____
4) Media (Radio/T.V./Magazines/Newspapers) ____
5) Legal/Financial advisors ____
6) Other:______________________________ ____

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS:

1. Do you intend to complete high school: No: 1
Maybe: 2
Yes: 3
Don't know

1a. If no, why not:

2. When will you graduate from High School: 1) 1976
2) 1977
3) 1978
4) 1979

3. How many students "dropped out" of school (in your grade) since entering high school:

1) very few
2) less than one quarter
3) one quarter to a half
4) a half to three quarters
5) more than three quarters

4. Can you list some reasons why they "dropped out":

5. To your knowledge, what are these people doing now:

6. What are the reasons you have remained in school:

7. What do you plan to do after you graduate:

1) attend college
2) attend a technical school
3) train for an occupation 3b) What occupation: ______________________________
4) take a full time job 4b) In this town: Yes/No
5) other: ___________________
6) Don't know

8. What occupation or career do you hope to enter:

9. If you are going to leave this community after you graduate, would you like someday to return to make this town your permanent home:

(Very much dislike 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) Don't know
(neutral)

10. If you are not married, do you plan to marry within the next year: 1) Yes 2) No Don't know

11. How many children do you hope to have:
1) None
2) One
3) Two
4) Three
5) Four
6) More than four

12. Do you think living in this community has been a good experience in preparing you for your future:

(Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know
(neutral)

13. Do you think going to school in this community has been a good experience in preparing you for your future:

(Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know
(neutral)

14. Do you live in __________ (insert name of community) 1) Yes 2) No

14a. If no, on a farm: 1) Yes 2) No

14b. How many miles away from _____ _____

14c. In another community: 1) Yes 2) No

14d. Name of community: ______

14e. How many miles away from_____: _________

GENERAL CODING INSTRUCTIONS

1. Questions not included in coding sheet should be aggregated manually.
2. Questions specific to "Farmers" and "Self-Employed" can easily be aggregated manually.
3. For all seven and three point scales code "Don't know" as zero.
4. Question #5: check=1, no check=0.

C.A.S. Data Coding Form

I.D. Number

Card Number

* 0 1

1 2 3 4 67 8 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 23 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 44 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 78 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 92 3 5 6 7 8 0 2 4 5 74 6 7 8 9 0 1 3 4 5 6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 90 1 2 3

* 0 2

7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 88 8 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 99 9 9 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 11

0 2 3 5 6 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 78 9 0 1 2 3 4 56 7 8 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 00

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 a b c a b a b a 1 2 3 40 1 2 3 4 6 78 9

Students

* 0 3

1 1 1 1 s s ss s s s s s s s

1 1 1 1 1 23 7 7 8 9 1 1 1 1 1

0 1 2 3 4 0 1 2 3 4

1 2 3 4 5 6 6 a b c e

* Note for key punch: Key punch only lines with asterisk.

CHAPTER IV

DEMONSTRATION: THE UNITY STUDY

The C.A.S. must handle and control a vast amount of information in a manner that will be of significant value to planners and decision makers. The analytical procedures organize the data so that the point of view of the local population is emphasized. Attitude factors are statistically generated from the data itself, using factor analysis. Factor analysis economizes the number of variables needed to interpret attitudes and isolates specific factors for descriptive purposes. The factors are generated from the attitudes of community members, rather than being invented and imposed upon the data by the researcher. Variables not included in the factor analysis, e.g., responses to open-ended questions, are inserted within appropriate factors and/or assessment sets. For some assessment sets, it becomes important to analyze communication networks and information flows in the community. Where it is relevant, such information is included in the discussion of the assessment set.

INTERPRETATION PERSPECTIVES

The information produced by the C.A.S. is designed to allow interpretation from a number of perspectives, depending on the specific requirements of particular planners and decision makers. The present instrument broadly probes assessments of a local population toward community modification. It generates some specific information on assessments about possible community modifications in the area of economic expansion, e.g., needed and desired job opportunities, expansion in commerce, industry, manufacturing and services. This kind of information should be useful when planners and decision makers are exploring possible community modification prospects. If information is desired on special topics, specifically-focussed questions can easily be added to the interview schedule.

If the C.A.S. is to be applied to assess community attitudes toward an already proposed development, the interview schedule will need to be modified and questions about this proposal added. Also, if an actual proposal has been made public prior to the application of the C.A.S., the information gathered will have to be interpreted in light of this fact. Interpretation of attitudes about the proposed project will be possible within the context of assessments made by the population regarding the future of their community. Finally, the C.A.S. can be applied in order to monitor community attitudes during the stages of an actual development. Again, the schedule can easily be modified for this type of application.

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

To demonstrate the potential use of the C.A.S., some of the information gathered in the town of Unity, Saskatchewan, during the summer of 1975 will be presented. The analysis herein must be understood as a limited example of the analytical potential of the C.A.S. An in-depth analysis of community attitudes toward development and expansion in Unity could be made from the data. This presentation can only suggest how this could be done. Specific recommendations will not be made, since the data was gathered while developing the instrument, and since interests and perspectives of particular planners are unspecified.

Unity, Saskatchewan, is a town of 2,295 (Census information is taken from the 1971 Enumeration Area Census, Statistics Canada, Ottawa) situated 120 miles west of Saskatoon on the main CNR line. The town was incorporated in 1919. Carle Zimmerman would categorize the town as a "Farm City", a service or trade centre serving an agricultural rural area. The Sifto Salt division of Domtar was established in Unity in 1949. Today, the largest ethnic groups in Unity are British (1105) and German (810). Roman Catholics constitute the largest religious group (1055), followed by United Church Members (845), and Anglicans (165). There are 550 families in the community, but 215 of these are childless. The average number of children per family with children is 3.87. The average family income in 1971 was $7,257.

Sampling in the town of Unity followed the procedures described in detail in Chapter III. The refusal rate, 39.4% is broken down in Table I according to the occupational and influential categories. It can easily be noted that influentials and proprietors were most willing to be interviewed, whereas housewives were least willing. One female interviewer, arranging appointments, noted that housewives often seemed to believe their opinions would be of no interest and that their attitudes were unimportant.

TABLE I

Category	Refusal Rate
Farmers	36.3
Farmwives	38.0
Housewives	70.6
Unskilled	46.0
Skilled	35.7
Clerical & Sales	35.7
Proprietors	16.6
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	36.3
Influentials	10.0
Retired	47.0

Table 2 presents the interview sample relative to the population in each occupational category. Retired people are analyzed separately.

TABLE 2

Category	Actual Population	Sample Cases	Weighted Cases
Farmers	153	7	11
Farmwives	104	7	7
Housewives	365	11	36
Unskilled	177	8	18
Skilled	115	8	12
Clerical & Sales	115	9	10
Management, Officials, Proprietors	91	15	10
Semi-Professional & Professional	110	12	9
Total	1230	77	114

The following tables represent the cross tabulation of all the structural variables used in the analysis. Only weighted cases are reported and scores are rounded off to the nearest whole number. In the Influential category, cases rather than votes were weighted. The actual number of influentials in the different occupational categories was: farmers (2), proprietors (7), professionals (8).

TABLE 3

OCCUPATIONS AND INFLUENTIALS

.01*

Category	Influential	Non-Influential	Total
Farmers	4	7	11
Farmwives	0	7	7
Housewives	0	36	36
Unskilled	0	18	18
Skilled	0	12	12
Clerical & Sales	0	10	10
Proprietors	4	5	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	8	3	11
Total	17	98	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 4

OCCUPATIONS AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION .03*

Category	High Participation	Low Participation	Total
Farmers	4	7	11
Farmwives	3	4	7
Housewives	10	27	36
Unskilled	4	13	18
Skilled	3	9	12
Clerical & Sales	1	9	10
Proprietors	8	1	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	5	6	11
Total	39	76	114

TABLE 5

OCCUPATIONS AND AGE .01*

Category	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Total
Farmers	2	0	2	2	4	0	11
Farmwives	0	3	3	1	0	0	7
Housewives	10	3	17	0	3	3	36
Unskilled	2	2	2	4	2	0	13
Skilled	1	4	0	3	3	0	12
Clerical & Sales	1	1	3	1	4	0	10
Proprietors	1	2	1	4	1	1	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	3	0	3	3	0	0	9
Total	21	17	30	19	17	5	108

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 6

OCCUPATIONS AND SEX .01*

Category	Male	Female	Total
Farmers	11	0	11
Farmwives	0	7	7
Housewives	0	36	36
Unskilled	7	11	18
Skilled	12	0	12
Clerical & Sales	0	10	10
Proprietors	7	2	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	9	2	11
Total	45	69	114

TABLE 7

OCCUPATIONS AND RELIGION .11*

	Religion				
Category	Anglican	United Church	Roman Catholic	Other	Total
Farmers	2	7	2	0	11
Farmwives	0	6	1	0	7
Housewives	3	10	17	7	36
Unskilled	2	9	4	2	18
Skilled	0	1	9	1	12
Clerical & Sales	1	5	4	0	10
Proprietors	1	3	3	2	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	3	5	1	2	11
Total	13	46	41	14	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 8

OCCUPATIONS AND ETHNIC GROUP .01*

Category	British Isles	German	Other	Total
Farmers	7	0	4	11
Farmwives	4	0	3	7
Housewives	13	17	7	36
Unskilled	11	2	4	18
Skilled	0	10	1	12
Clerical & Sales	8	1	1	10
Proprietors	4	2	2	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	9	2	0	11
Total	56	35	23	114

TABLE 9

OCCUPATIONS AND YEARS RESIDENT IN COMMUNITY .16*

Category	0 - 10	10 - 20	20+	Total
Farmers	0	0	11	11
Farmwives	0	6	1	7
Housewives	10	13	13	36
Unskilled	4	4	9	18
Skilled	4	0	7	12
Clerical & Sales	5	1	4	10
Proprietors	3	3	3	9
Semi-Professionals & Professionals	6	3	2	11
Total	33	33	51	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 10

INFLUENCE AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION .40*

Category	High Participation	Low Participation	Total
Influentials	8	9	17
Non-Influentials	31	67	98
Total	39	76	114

TABLE 11

INFLUENCE AND AGE .01*

Category	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Total
Influential	1	0	3	8	3	0	15
Non-Influentials	20	17	28	11	14	5	93
Total	21	17	30	19	17	5	108

TABLE 12

INFLUENCE AND SEX .01*

Category	Male	Female	Total
Influential	16	1	17
Non-Influential	29	68	98
Total	45	69	114

TABLE 13

INFLUENCE AND RELIGION .64*

Category	Anglican	United Church	Roman Catholic	Other	Total
Influential	3	6	4	3	17
Non-Influential	10	39	37	12	98
Total	13	45	41	15	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 14

INFLUENCE AND ETHNICITY .12*

Category	British Isles	German	Others	Total
Influential	10	3	4	17
Non-Influential	46	32	20	98
Total	56	35	24	114

TABLE 15

INFLUENCE AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .83*

Category	0-10	10-20	20+	Total
Influential	4	5	7	17
Non-Influential	29	26	43	98
Total	33	31	51	114

TABLE 16

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND AGE .07*

Category	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Total
High Participants	2	7	14	9	4	1	38
Low Participants	18	10	16	10	13	3	70
Total	20	17	30	19	17	5	108

TABLE 17

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND SEX .01*

Category	Male	Female	Total
High Participants	17	21	39
Low Participants	28	48	76
Total	45	69	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 18

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND RELIGION .21*

Category	Anglican	United Church	Roman Catholic	Other	Total
High Participants	8	16	11	4	39
Low Participants	5	30	30	10	76
Total	13	46	41	14	114

TABLE 19

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND ETHNICITY .18*

Category	British	German	Other	Total
High Participants	23	10	6	39
Low Participants	33	25	18	76
Total	56	35	24	114

TABLE 20

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .01*

Category	0-10	10-20	20+	Total
High Participants	3	15	21	39
Low Participants	29	16	30	76
Total	33	31	51	114

TABLE 21

AGE AND SEX .01*

Age	Male	Female	Total
20-29	8	12	21
30-39	9	8	17
40-49	5	25	30
50-59	13	6	19
60-69	7	10	17
70+	1	4	5
Total	43	65	108

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 22

AGE AND RELIGION .01*

Age	Anglican	United Church	Roman Catholic	Other	Total
20-29	4	9	7	1	21
30-39	0	2	14	1	17
40-49	6	13	8	3	30
50-59	2	7	6	5	19
60-69	2	8	4	3	17
70+	0	4	1	0	5
Total	13	43	39	13	108

TABLE 23

AGE AND ETHNICITY .01*

Age	British Isles	German	Other	Total
20-29	9	6	6	21
30-39	3	12	1	17
40-49	20	8	1	30
50-59	13	1	4	19
60-69	10	6	1	17
70+	1	0	4	5
Total	55	34	19	108

TABLE 24

AGE AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .01*

Age	1-10 years	10-20 years	20+ years	Total
20-29	8	6	7	21
30-39	9	4	3	17
40-49	2	15	13	30
50-59	3	3	13	19
60-69	6	1	10	17
70+	1	0	4	5
Total	30	28	51	108

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 25

SEX AND RELIGION .99*

Category	Anglican	United Church	Roman Catholic	Other	Total
Male	6	18	16	5	45
Female	7	28	25	9	69
Total	13	46	41	14	114

TABLE 26

SEX AND ETHNICITY .41*

Category	British	German	Other	Total
Male	21	17	8	45
Females	35	18	16	69
Total	56	35	24	114

TABLE 27

SEX AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .19*

Category	0-10	10-20	20+	Total
Males	13	8	24	45
Females	19	23	27	69
Total	33	31	51	114

TABLE 28

RELIGION AND ETHNICITY .01*

Category	British Isles	German	Other	Total
Anglican	11	0	2	13
United Church	36	3	7	46
Roman Catholic	3	27	12	41
Other	7	5	2	14
Total	56	35	23	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

TABLE 29

RELIGION AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .05*

Category	0-10	10-20	20-30	Total
Anglican	4	4	5	13
United Church	6	13	26	46
Roman Catholic	18	12	11	41
Other	5	2	8	14
Total	33	31	51	114

TABLE 30

ETHNICITY AND YEARS IN COMMUNITY .31*

Category	0-10	10-20	20+	Total
British	12	14	31	56
German	14	10	7	35
Other	7	7	9	24
Total	33	31	51	114

*Level of significance of chi-square.

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FACTORS

Seventeen interpretable factors were generated from the Unity Study data. Related factors are classified in six groups called "assessment sets". Additional information from the Study is presented in the following discussion where it is relevant to a particular assessment set, factor or variable. Below is a list of the six assessment sets and the factors grouped within each set.

ASSESSMENT SETS

1. Environment and Life

   Factors:
   - a) Community Environment[*]
   - b) Community Solidarity
   - c) Community Life
   - d) Social Interaction

2. Diversity and Growth
   - a) Social Diversity
   - b) Attitudes toward Change
   - c) Future growth

3. Development
   - a) Agricultural Development
   - b) Urban Economic Development

4. Local Control
   - a) Environmental Control
   - b) Business Control
   - c) Control and Unskilled Labour

5. Employment Opportunities
   - a) Blue Collar Job Opportunities
   - b) White Collar Job Opportunities

---

[*] Order of factors based on eigenvalues of 1 or above within each assessment set: 1) 2, 1, 17, 13; 2) 12, 14, 7; 3) 9, 11; 4) 8, 10, 15; 5) 3, 4; 6) 5, 6, 16.

6) Income Support Systems

  - a) Financial Support Systems
  - b) Job Support Systems
  - c) Mobility

ASSESSMENT SET 1: ENVIRONMENT AND LIFE

The factors of Community Environment, Community Solidarity, Community Life and Social Interaction have been grouped together because each describes the assessments of the population toward the physical and social environment of the community. All factors focus upon assessments of the community as the "setting" in which people live out their lives. Analysis tables for each factor may be found at the end of the discussion of each assessment set.

a) The factor, Community Environment, includes assessments of both the physical and the social environment of Unity. Important assessments include attitudes about the appearance of the community and its natural surroundings as well as about its social atmosphere. In general, the respondents have rather positive feelings about their environment. The grand mean for the variables ranged from 5.5 to 5.9. (In all cases, unless otherwise noted, the scale for which the grand mean is reported ranges from 1 to 7.)

Age and years of residence are the structural variables most significant in accounting for the variations in assessments. The 30-39 and 60-69 age groups assess the community's physical and social environment most positively, while the 40-49 and the 70+ age groups assess the community most negatively. This result is most difficult to interpret. Newer residents of the community assess the factor positively, but older residents make more negative assessments. From the cross tabulation of age and years of residence, it is apparent that these structural variables are closely related. Examining other structural variables, we find that proprietors, high community participants, males and Roman Catholics tend to assess the environment of the community more positively than do other groups.

One of the more interesting variables within this factor is work enjoyment and satisfaction with one's job. The analysis indicates that work enjoyment tends to be relatively high in all groups (grand mean 5.9, s.d. .85). Influentials, high community participants and males, however, tend to enjoy their work more than do their counterparts.

It is also significant to note that 35% of all respondents express a willingness to retrain, and 12% more say they might be interested in retraining. Eighty-seven per cent (87%) of the unskilled say they are willing to retrain; 40% of the farmers; 37% of the skilled workers (plus 25% who state that they might be interested). The group least willing to retrain are the housewives: only 18% are willing, and 9% more give a qualified response. Only 29% of the respondents express a desire to change occupations, and another 9% express willingness, but with qualifications. More females than males are interested in changing occupations (32% yes/4% qualified; 23% yes/ 17% qualified). A different occupation appeals more to 40 to 60 year olds (40-49: 36%; 50-59: 33%) than to any other age group. However, 20 to 40 year olds are more willing to retrain (20-29: 45% yes/ 23% qualified; 30-39: 47% yes/ 20% qualified) and participate in upgrading programs (20-29: 41% yes/ 26% qualified; 30-39: 57% yes) than are members of other age groups.

b) The second factor, Community Solidarity, encompasses perceptions of "togetherness" or cohesion among members of the community. The morale of the community as well as the spirit of working together are also implicit in the concept. Of particular importance are assessments about the willingness of neighbours to help in times of trouble and about the extent to which community members have a great deal in common. In general, the population assesses community solidarity favourably. The grand mean for the variables ranges from 4.5 to 5.0.

On this dimension, occupation and sex are the most significant structural variables. Farmwives and housewives make negative assessments and males make positive assessments, probably mirroring occupational differences. Assessments of community solidarity vary somewhat according to age and ethnic group, although the age differences probably reflect occupational and sex differences.

Perceptions of the future of the community relate directly to this factor, presumably because the future is viewed as a reality that will affect community solidarity since the future will be shared by all within the community. Generally, assessments of the future of the community are positive (grand mean: 5.0/ s.d. 1.2). Proprietors (6.0/s.d. .72) foresee a more positive future than do other occupational groups, with housewives being rather negative (3.8/s.d. 1.5). Since Unity is thriving as a farm service centre, the response of the proprietors might be understood as a firm belief in the power of positive thinking. The response of the housewives, however, seems to indicate a general tendency among females in the sample to be less optimistic than males about the future. Generally, non-influentials are less optimistic than influentials. This might be explained by the fact that influentials generally exhibit expressive as well as instrumental leadership qualities. They also tend to be high community participants, male and professionals, proprietors or farmers. Respondents in their twenties ([illegible] / s.d. 1.2) and forties (4.7 / s.d. 1.1) are less positive than are members of other age groups about the future of the community. The reasons most often given for optimism about the future of the community include: the town of Unity is located in a good farming area; industry has located there, e.g., the salt plant; the town is a service centre with a with a history of steady growth; there is potential for new industry; Unity has a young and progressive population, good local businessmen and at the present time is witnessing an expansion of new construction. Quite a number of respondents say that Unity is "far enough away" from larger urban centres to ensure relatively autonomous future development as a service centre and has resources (physical and human, developed and undeveloped) which should attract industries suitable to the locality.

Reasons given for a possible poor future for the community indicate a strong belief in an inevitable cycle of feast followed by famine. A strike at the salt plant while interviewing was going on concerns many people. More express concern about the gradual decline of rural social life and population and worry that growth might change the "friendly", "personal", "close" social atmosphere of the community. Some degree of concern is expressed about the necessity for Unity to offer more services and provide a higher quality of service, if the community is not to lose business to larger centres. The need for young adults to be integrated and accepted as equally contributing members to the community, its organizations and activities is also voiced by many respondents.

Suggestions to improve the community's future include (only those mentioned by three or more respondents are included here): expansion of small industry, especially industry related to agriculture; more subsidized and adequate housing; more democracy in community groups; "continue to work to build as a community"; more community participation from business people; fewer strikes; and development of natural resources in the area.

c) The third factor was interpreted as an assessment of Community Life. How people feel about living in the community is the most important variable within this factor. Having relatives living nearby is another important aspect of this factor, as are assessments about friendliness and about having things in common with other local inhabitants. The community assesses the important variables in this factor in various ways. The friendliness of the community is assesed as being slightly less today than it was in the past (grand mean 3.7), whereas the present friendly atmosphere of the community is judged as being relatively high (grand mean 5.5). People generally do not care whether or not relatives live nearby (grand mean 4.5), but almost everyone interviewed definitely likes living in the community (grand mean 6.1).

Occupation, age and years of residence are the most significant structural variables. Farmwives, but not farmers and housewives, make a very high assessment of community life. Skilled workers make a very negative assessment. This is in marked contrast with the second factor, Community Solidarity, where the assessments are reversed, indicating that a positive evaluation of community life is not necessarily associated with an experience of community solidarity. This is perhaps, because farmwives are frequently isolated from those aspects of the community which influence feelings of solidarity. This isolation, however, does not prevent them from having a very positive attitude toward living in the community. It would seem that farmwives have a different picture of their relationship to the community than do groups living in town.

The youngest age group (20-29) makes a negative assessment of community life, whereas the 30-39 age group makes a positive assessment. Higher age groups make progressively less favourable assessments. Years of residence in the community shows a similar pattern of response, with a positive assessment by the two shorter residence groups (0-10 and 10-20 years) and a negative assessment by the third group (20+ years of residence). This again is apparently a reversal of the response to community solidarity, reinforcing the conclusion that community life and community solidarity are not viewed by respondents in the same way. A negative feeling about community solidarity does not necessarily imply that one is dissatisfied with living in the community.

One of the more interesting variables in this factor is the assessment about whether the community is more friendly in the present than it was in the past. Interestingly, people who have lived in the community less than 10 years feel the community is slightly more friendly now (4.5 / s.d. 1.6) than in the past, whereas people who have lived in the community longer feel friendliness is slightly less today (10-20 years: 3.7 / s.d. .71; 20+ years: 3.3 / s.d. 1.4). Roman Catholics feel the community is more friendly today (4.1 / s.d. 1.4) than in the past.

Eighty-four per cent of all respondents say that the people of the community feel they have a great deal in common. Fewer Roman Catholics (74%) and those in the religious category, "Other" (76%), make this assessment than do either Anglicans (83%) or United Church members (96%). It may be concluded that newer residents (0-10 years) and Roman Catholics find the community more friendly and perceive it as being less homogeneous today than do those groups (British, Anglicans, United Church members) who tended to dominate community affairs in the past. British, Anglicans and United Church members seem to perceive Unity as a less differentiated community than do either newcomers or German Catholics. This difference in perception may account for the numerous comments made by respondents who were non-German and non-Catholic that the German Catholics often do not "get behind" and participants in community activities as much as do other religious or ethnic groups in the community. Rather, they seem to put forth efforts on behalf of their own church.

d) The factor, Social Interaction, encompasses the social relationships among members of the population. Of particular importance to social interaction are the assessments made about how often people of the community get together, about the friendliness of the community and about the size of community in which respondents would prefer to live. The amount of social interaction, in part, relates to the number of people living within a community. The number of possible interrelationships increases geometrically with the number of people. Within this factor, grand means range from 4.9 to 3.7.

Five structural variables are significantly related to this factor. The most important of these is occupation. Farmers, farmwives and skilled workers make negative assessments about social interaction in the community, whereas housewives make positive assessments. When these results are compared with those for the first two factors in this assessment set, it is clear that occupational groups can make unexpectedly diverse assessments of their community: farmwives with negative assessments of community solidarity and community life make positive assessments of social interaction; skilled workers with positive assessments of community solidarity make negative assessments of community life and social interaction. Proprietors also make positive assessments of community solidarity but negative assessments of social interaction within the community. There is no easily observed pattern in these results. Each factor must represent a different perspective about the social environment and the members of the occupational categories seem to adopt these different perspectives when making their assessments.

Occupational differences clearly seem to underlie the apparent differences in the various age, sex and years of residence groups.

The age groups significantly differ in their assessments of social interaction in the community. The 60-69 age group have very negative views of community social interaction, perhaps as a result of the large number of farmers and skilled workers in this category. The years of residence groups also show significant differences in their assessments. Those who have lived in the community between 10 and 20 years, for example, make a positive assessment but those who have lived in the community between 0 and 10 years or more than 20 years make negative assessments. Sex differences are significant, but these probably reflect the occupational differences. Males make negative assessments about social interaction, but so do members of the predominantly male occupations - farmers and skilled workers. Females make positive assessments as do housewives.

High community participants make negative assessments about social interaction in the community. It is unexpected to find that those people who are members, and often officials, of a number of community organizations should make such negative assessments. "Community participation," as defined in this report, refers to formalized interaction. It must thus be assumed that this factor represents assessments about informal social interaction which the high community participants assess negatively.

It was interesting to discover in examining this factor that the majority of respondents, and in particular, farmers, farmwives, clerical and sales workers, high community participants, people in their twenties, fifties and sixties all desire to live in a community having a population between one and five thousand people (grand mean 4.2 / s.d. 1.9). Members of groups expressing a desire to live in a community of five to ten thousand include professionals and semi-professionals (5.6 / s.d. 3.3), 30-39 year olds (5.6 / s.d. 2.7), and those who have lived in the community for less than ten years (5.3 / s.d. 2.8).

A series of open-ended questions that indirectly probe the social interaction dynamics of the community requested respondents to list community programs and activities which are not available in the community at present, but which might be desired by the respondents. (Some of those interviewed responded that in their opinion the community is over-organized, with groups activities and programs competing for participants, time and financial aid.) The compiled lists include only those programs and activities which are mentioned by two or more people. The order of the lists is inconsequential.

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES NOT AVAILABLE BUT DESIRED:

Community College
University Extension Program
   (General B.A. should be offered)
Community Aid/Crisis Line
Marriage and family counseling
Youth counseling
Day care
Indoor swimming pool
Drama presentations
Violin teacher

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE PRESENT IN THE COMMUNITY BUT JUDGED IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT:

Curling rink
   How to improve: Artificial ice
Swimming pool
   How to improve: More equipment for children
                   Paddling pool
General Sports and recreation
   How to improve: Develop and use more local talent.
                   Lower costs especially for students.
                   Supply more trained coaches
More offerings in recreation, health and social programs
   (especially during winter).
Better and more senior citizen housing
   How to improve: Give financial aid.

THE RETIRED

The assessments made by retired people were analyzed separately. Their assessments were not included in the factor analysis nor were factor scores calculated for this group. An analysis of variance was calculated for the responses of the retired to each question, in order that responses to specific variables could be reported. Retired people feel positively about the physical and social environment of the community (5.3) (5.8) in much the same way as do the career adults. Most interestingly, the retired express very positive satisfaction with their work (6.3) as compared with the career adults (5.9). Generally, they like living in the community (6.2) and assess the future of the community more highly (5.3) than do the career adults (grand mean 5.0). The retired wish to live in a community of five thousand or less (4.0).

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

High school students make more negative assessments about the physical and social environment of the community than do either the career adults or the retired. They rate the natural surroundings of the community at 4.8 and the social atmosphere at 5.0. Their view of the future of the community is also slightly more negative (4.9) than that of other groups. Generally, they express a desire to live in a community of five thousand or less (4.5).

FACTOR VARIABLES:

Factor 1: Environment

Questions

1. What do you think of the appearance of this community:

(Very unattractive) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very attractive) No opinion ___
(neutral)

.77 factor loading   5.6 mean   .8 standard deviation

2. What is the social atmosphere of this community

   (Very unfriendly) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very friendly) Don't know ___
   (neutral)

   .70 factor loading 5.5 mean 1.1 standard deviation

3. Do you enjoy your work:

   (Absolutely not) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Absolutely yes)
   (neutral)

   .60 factor loading 5.9 mean .8 standard deviation

4. What do you think of the natural surroundings of this community:

   (Very unattractive) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very attractive) No opinion ___
   (neutral)

   .49 factor loading 5.0 mean 1.0 standard deviation

5. What do you think about Business Associations:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ___
   (neutral)

   -.37 factor loading 5.5 mean 1.5 standard deviation

Factor 2: Solidarity

Questions

1. When someone has something on his/her mind that is bother him/her, are neighbours willing to help: Yes/No

   .79 factor loading 91 percent yes

2. Do people in this community feel they have a great deal in common: Yes/No

   .52 factor loading 84 percent yes

3. What do you think of the future of this community compared to the present:

   (Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know ___
   (same)

   .47 factor loading 5.0 mean 1.2 standard deviation

4. How do you feel about tourists visiting this region:

(Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like) No opinion ___
(neutral)

.38 factor loading 5.4 mean 1.2 standard deviation

5. Is having relatives living nearby important to you:

(Very unimportant) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very important) Don't know ___
(neutral)

.37 factor loading 4.5 mean 1.6 standard deviation

Factor 3: Community Life

Questions

1. How do you feel about living in this community:

(Dislike very much) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Like very much) Don't know ___
(neutral)

.83 factor loading 6.1 mean .8 standard deviation

2. Is having relatives living nearby important to you:

(Very unimportant) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very important) Don't know ___
(neutral)

.44 factor loading 4.5 mean 1.6 standard deviation

3. Do people in this community feel they have a great deal in common: Yes/No

.43 factor loading 84 percent yes

4. Is "friendliness" in this community:

(Much more in past 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more friendly now) Don't know___
(same)

.38 factor loading 3.7 mean 1.3 standard deviation

5. What is the social atmosphere of this community

(Very unfriendly) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very friendly) Don't know ___
(neutral)

.37 factor loading 5.5 mean 1.1 standard deviation

Factor 4: Social Interaction

Questions

1. During the year do people in the community get together quite often: Yes/No

   .68 factor loading   77 percent yes

2. Is "friendliness" in this community:

   (Much more in past) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more friendly now) Don't know ___
   (same)

   .63 factor loading   3.7 mean   1.3 standard deviation

3. Size of community you would prefer to live in:

   1) farm
   2) community under 499 population
   3) 500-999
   4) 1,000-4,999
   5) 5,000-9,999
   6) 10,000-14,999
   7) 15,000-19,999
   8) 20,000-29,999
   9) 30,000-49,999
   10) 50,000-99,999
   11) 100,000 and above

   .59 factor loading   4.2 mean   1.9 standard deviation

4. In comparison to the present, who should make decisions:

   a. When Provincially or Federally financed recreation areas are developed in or near this community

      (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
      (same as
      present)

      -.42 factor loading   4.8 mean   1.3 standard deviation

In comparison to the present, who should make decisions

b. If changes are to be made in the local schools:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
(same as
present)

-.35 factor loading   4.9 mean   1.6 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: ENVIRONMENT

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.01	.91
Occupations			
.10*	Farmers	.08	1.09
	Farmwives	.24	1.26
	Housewives	-.43	.69
	Unskilled	.21	1.22
	Skilled	.08	.78
	Clerical & Sales	-.02	.52
	Proprietors	.44	.86
	Professionals	.25	.68
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.00	.92
	Non-Influential	-.01	.91
Community Participation			
.10	High	.21	1.06
	Low	-.12	.82
Age			
.01	20-29	-.16	.66
	30-39	.64	.72
	40-49	-.41	.84
	50-59	-.00	.58
	60-69	.21	1.22
	70+	-.32	1.12
Sex			
.10	Male	.16	.75
	Female	-.13	.99
Religion			
.10	Anglican	-.24	.90
	United Church	-.10	1.03
	Roman Catholic	.28	.78
	Other	-.33	.65
Ethnicity			
--	British	-.12	.99
	German	.06	.72
	Other	.12	.95
Years Residence			
.01	0-10	.47	.72
	10-20	-.36	.88
	20+	-.14	.92

*Level of Significance

FACTOR 2: SOLIDARITY

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.08	.99
Occupations			
.01	Farmers	.14	.94
	Farmwives	-1.20	1.00
	Housewives	-.40	1.07
	Unskilled	.03	.90
	Skilled	.49	.68
	Clerical & Sales	.10	.75
	Proprietors	.47	.84
	Professionals	-.04	.90
Influentials			
—	Influential	.07	.76
	Non-Influential	-.11	1.04
Community Participation			
--	High	-.03	1.06
	Low	-.10	.97
Age			
.25	20-29	.12	1.13
	30-39	-.53	1.40
	40-49	-.15	.62
	50-59	-.12	.89
	60-69	.43	.71
	70+	-.63	1.52
Sex			
.01	Male	.30	.83
	Female	-.34	1.02
Religion			
--	Anglican	-.26	.92
	United Church	.05	.96
	Roman Catholic	-.06	1.14
	Other	-.05	.84
Ethnicity			
.25	British	-.11	.94
	German	.15	.98
	Other	-.38	1.13
Years Residence			
--	0-10	-.24	1.14
	10-20	-.08	.89
	20+	.02	.96

*Level of Significance

FACTOR 3: LIFESTYLE

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean	-.01	1.02
Occupations			
.05	Farmers	.17	.09
	Farmwives	.97	.69
	Housewives	-.21	.80
	Unskilled	-.13	1.32
	Skilled	-.74	1.18
	Clerical & Sales	.44	1.09
	Proprietors	.09	.93
	Professionals	.40	.90
Influentials			
.25	Influential	.35	.90
	Non-Influential	-.08	1.03
Community Participation			
--	High	-.15	1.05
	Low	.04	1.01
Age			
.05	20-29	-.49	.55
	30-39	.52	.94
	40-49	.09	.62
	50-59	-.18	1.01
	60-69	-.18	1.63
	70+	-.94	.50
Sex			
--	Male	-.00	1.06
	Female	-.03	.97
Religion			
--	Anglican	.22	.84
	United Church	-.05	.95
	Roman Catholic	-.04	1.13
	Other	-.08	1.12
Ethnicity			
--	British	.03	.95
	German	.07	1.00
	Other	-.28	1.22
Years Residence			
.05	0-10	.18	1.18
	10-20	.23	.85
	20+	-.32	.93

*Level of Significance

FACTOR 4: INTERACTION

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean	-.01	1.01
Occupations			
.01	Farmers	-1.05	.80
	Farmwives	-.73	.66
	Housewives	.55	1.09
	Unskilled	.11	.75
	Skilled	-.43	.68
	Clerical & Sales	-.17	1.06
	Proprietors	-.30	.94
	Professionals	.09	.59
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.20	.69
	Non-Influential	.02	1.05
Community Participation			
.05	High	-.31	.93
	Low	.13	1.02
Age			
.05	20-29	.18	.83
	30-39	.03	1.04
	40-49	.17	1.11
	50-59	-.20	.65
	60-69	-.92	.98
	70+	.15	.99
Sex			
.01	Male	-.36	.77
	Female	.23	1.08
Religion			
.25	Anglican	-.18	.61
	United Church	-.14	.89
	Roman Catholic	.26	1.06
	Other	-.17	1.37
Ethnicity			
--	British	-.03	.90
	German	-.06	1.24
	Other	.16	.89
Years Residence			
.05	0-10	-.01	1.21
	10-20	.38	.80
	20+	-.24	.89

*Level of Significance

COMMUNICATION NETWORKS AND INFORMATION FLOWS

The C.A.S. includes questions that elicit information about community communication networks and information flows. The following discussion of these is included at this point because a description of social influence and influential institutions will enhance understanding of the assessment set, Environment and Life.

1. The respondents were asked to name community members they considered to be influential. The category, "Influential", includes anyone mentioned by three or more respondents. The influentials are professionals (8), proprietors and managers (7) and farmers (2). They are almost equally divided between high community participants (8) and low community participants (9). Only one is in his twenties, three in their forties, three in their sixties and eight are between fifty and fifty-nine. Two did not give their ages. Six of the influentials are United Church members, whereas only four are Roman Catholic, the religion of the majority of the citizens of Unity. Three are Anglicans and four are of other denominations. Ten are British, three, German and four from the other ethnic groups. Only one is female! Of the influentials, the majority have lived in the community for more than ten years.

This profile of the influentials suggests that the dynamics of influence in Unity are complex, diverse and diffused throughout a wide spectrum of community structures. Information of this kind when examined with relation to attitudinal information should be useful to any planner or decision maker.

2. The responses to the question: "How do you most often learn about local community news and events?" Indicate the local newspaper as the most important of the local media, followed in order by "friends", "neighbours" and radio. Farmers were asked from whom they seek farm advice. Friends and relatives are most often mentioned, with neighbours, the media and

government/University Extension Services following in order of importance. The self employed were also asked from whom they seek business advice. People in the same or related business are most important, followed by legal/financial advisors, company representatives and friends/relatives.

COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION DATA TABLES

TABLE 1

Question:

How do you most often learn about local community news and events:

1. Local newspaper
2. Regional newspaper
3. Radio
4. Television
5. Friends
6. Neighbours
7. Social Acquaintances
8. Business Acquaintances
9. Formal meetings
10. Other

continued

TABLE 1 (continued)

Table of Positive Response (Percent Yes)

Structural Variables	Local News-Paper	Regional Newspaper	Radio	Tele-vision	Friends	Neigh-bours	Social Acquain-tances	Business Acquain-tances	Formal Meetings	Other
Grand Mean	94	23	61	49	67	67	38	34	23	7
Occupations										
Farmers	100	40	100	60	40	60	20	0	20	0
Farmwives	100	20	100	40	80	60	40	20	0	0
Housewives	100	36	63	63	72	63	27	27	36	9
Unskilled	98	25	62	50	50	75	50	12	12	12
Skilled	100	0	37	37	87	75	12	37	0	12
Clerical & Sales	96	0	50	50	62	87	50	87	0	12
Proprietors	100	13	53	26	80	46	33	80	46	6
Professionals	100	18	27	27	72	72	90	45	45	0
Influentials										
Influential	100	6	50	15	71	72	54	36	57	3
Non-Influential	93	26	62	55	67	66	35	33	17	8
Community Participation										
High	94	15	47	36	64	70	44	33	46	11
Low	94	27	68	55	69	66	34	34	12	6
Age										
20-29	100	56	68	79	59	31	65	34	4	0
30-39	92	20	39	20	70	70	29	47	27	28
40-49	100	19	67	49	74	68	41	19	39	0
50-59	93	0	43	22	65	61	44	49	49	10
60-69	79	25	76	60	54	67	7	25	0	12
70+	100	13	100	86	86	86	0	26	0	0
Sex										
Male	100	19	53	38	69	66	47	30	28	4
Female	91	26	66	54	66	68	32	26	20	9
Religion										
Anglican	90	16	37	45	59	69	69	26	40	0
United Church	95	30	61	49	61	58	53	28	21	4
Roman Catholic	93	16	69	43	64	77	19	43	25	16
Other	100	27	58	68	72	67	15	33	8	0
Ethnicity										
British	89	30	53	46	64	61	48	28	27	6
German	100	19	61	41	74	70	20	37	23	13
Other	100	12	78	69	65	78	37	43	12	3
Years of Residence										
0-10	88	15	56	44	71	66	37	45	22	14
10-20	100	22	54	49	68	61	39	36	31	2
20+	95	29	67	52	65	65	25	25	18	7
Levels of Chi-Square Significance										
Occupations	.01	.01	.08	.05	.01	.08	.01	.01	.01	.07
Influence	--	--	--	.10	--	--	.04	--	.01	--
Community Participation	.12	.01	--	--	.18	.08	.10	--	.01	--
Age	.04	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.09	.02	.01	.04
Sex	.01	--	--	--	.18	.07	--	--	.03	.15
Religion	--	.01	--	.01	--	.01	.01	--	.03	--
Ethnicity	.01	.01	.01	.02	.01	.03	.01	.02	.01	--
Years	--	.03	.01	.07	.01	.10	.03	--	--	--

TABLE 2

Question:

From whom do you seek advice most frequently about your farm: (Rank 5 in order of frequency)

1) Friends/relatives
2) Neighbours
3) Company representatives
4) Media (Radio/T.V., etc.)
5) Government/University Extension Services
6) Veterinarians
7) Other

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Rank
Friends/relatives	4		2		2	8	1
Neighbours		4				4	3
Company representatives			2			2	6
Media (Radio/ T.V., etc.)				4		4	4
Government/University Extension Services	2	2				4	2
Veterinarians						0	7
Other	2					2	5

TABLE 3

Question:

From whom do you seek advice most frequently about your business: (Rank in order of importance and frequency)

1) Friends/relatives
2) People in the same or related business
3) Company representatives
4) Media (Radio/T.V./Magazines/Newspapers)
5) Legal/Financial advisors
6) Other

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Rank
Friends/relatives	3		1			4	4
People in the same or related business	5	3	1			9	1
Company representatives	2	2	1			5	3
Media (Radio/T.V./ Magazines/Newspapers)	1	1	1			3	6
Legal/Financial advisors	4	3	1			8	2
Other	1	2		1		4	5

ASSESSMENT SET 2: DIVERSITY AND GROWTH

The factors of Social Diversity, Attitudes Towards Change and perceptions of the community's Future Growth have been grouped together in this assessment set.

a) The factor, Social Diversity, includes assessments about the degree of homogeneity of the community and about the quality of housing. Perceptions of the quality of housing indicate assessments of social diversity, perhaps because type of homes (run down / well kept; adequate room / cramped quarters; etc.) tend to symbolize levels of affluence. Perceptions of the future standard of living, and attitudes toward control of recreation area decisions and expansion of jobs in retail and wholesale trade are also part of this factor. There is no consistent pattern to the assessments; grand means range from 5.0 to 3.9.

High community participants and the British make more negative assessments than do the majority of the sample, particularly low community participants and those not British or German. Those who are in their twenties and those who have lived in the community less than ten years are more negative than older people and longer residents. It must be noted that young short-term residents tend also to be low community participants and non-British.

Sixty-four per cent of the respondents believe that people in the community have diverse backgrounds or life styles. Religion, ethnicity and age are the most significant structural variables relating to this belief. Only 24% of the Anglicans believe the community is heterogeneous, whereas 73% of the United Church members, 68% of the Roman Catholics and 60% of those belonging to other religious groups define the community as heterogeneous. Forty-eight per cent of the British, 66% of the Germans and

100% of the other ethnic groups believe the community is heterogeneous. More people in their twenties and over fifty respond that the community is heterogeneous (20-29: 85%; 50-59: 68%; 60-69: 60%; 70+: 100%) than do the middle age groups (30-39: 47%; 40-49: 51%).

Generally, people feel their housing is adequate (grand mean 5.0 / s.d. 1.0). Structural variables of significance are community participation, age, ethnicity and years of residence. High community participants feel their housing is less adequate (4.7 / s.d. .95) than do low participants (5.2 / s.d. 1.0). Those in their twenties (5.8 / s.d. .97) and thirties (5.6 / s.d. 1.0) feel their housing is more adequate than do other age groups (40-49: 4.3 / s.d. .49: 50-59: 4.7 / s.d. 1.0; 60-69: 4.8 / s.d. .91) with the exception of those over seventy (5.4 / s.d. .80). British are less satisfied with the adequacy of their housing (4.8 / s.d. .93) than are other ethnic groups (German: 5.0 / s.d. 1.1; Other: 5.7 / s.d. .97). Finally, those who have lived in the community more than twenty years are less satisfied (4.6 / s.d. .84) than people who have lived in the community a shorter time (0-10 years: 5.7 / s.d. 1.1; 10-20: 5.0 / s.d. .87).

Generally, the community feels that the standard of living during the next ten years will not be better than it has been during the last ten years (grand mean 3.9 / s.d. 1.3). Housewives (3.3 / s.d. 1.2) and the unskilled (3.8 / s.d. 1.8) are the least optimistic. Males (4.3 / s.d. 1.0), influentials (4.4 / s.d. 1.3) and high community participants (3.9 / s.d. 1.3) are more optimistic than their counterparts. As people get older they seem to be less optimistic about the future standard of living. When reasons are given for a rise in the standard of living in the future, the focus is not on material conditions, which are expected, at best, to remain the same, but on the non-material quality of group and community life, which it is hoped will improve. A general consensus seems to be that "hard times" produce a better quality of community life and more concern about neighbours. In the next ten years respondents expect unemployment to increase as well as economic instability, recession, increased welfare, curtailment of personal spending and consumption, increases in the costs of goods and services, greater debt and generally less affluence.

Respondents generally believe that decisions regarding provincially and federally-financed recreation areas should be handled in the future in much the same manner as they are at present (grand mean 4.8 / s.d. 1.3). However, proprietors (5.4 / s.d. 1.0) and skilled workers (5.3 / s.d. .72), influentials (5.3 / s.d. 1.0), high community participants (5.3 / s.d. 1.0), males (5.0 / s.d. .98) and those who have lived in the community for over thirty years (5.2 / s.d. 1.0) generally desire more local control over the development of recreation areas than exists at present. Respondents are not very interested in the expansion of jobs in the retail and wholesale trade sector (grand mean 4.6 / s.d. 1.2). Age, ethnicity and years of residence are the most significant structural variables related to this attitude. People in their twenties (5.1 / s.d. .69) and thirties (5.3 / s.d. 1.4) are most interested in the expansion of jobs in this sector. As people get older, they seem to be progressively less interested in expanding retail and wholesale trade job opportunities (40-49: 4.9; 50-59: 4.1; 60-69: 4.0; 70+: 3.4). Germans are most interested in this area of expansion (5.0 / s.d. 1.2), whereas British (4.7 / s.d. 1.1) and especially people from other ethnic groups (3.6 / s.d. 1.3) are less interested. People who have lived in the community between ten and twenty years (5.2 / s.d. 1.1) are more interested in having more jobs in retail and wholesale trade than are those who have lived in Unity for less than ten years (4.6 / s.d. 1.6) or those who have lived there for more than twenty years (4.2 / s.d. 1.0).

b) Attitudes Toward Change in the community are most clearly evident from the responses to the question: "To what extent do you perceive the residents of this community resistant to change?" Perceptions of the inadequacy of personal income are also important here. The assessments are generally neutral, that is, the community's attitude toward change is seen as neither resistant nor receptive. Grand means in the factor range from 4.5 to 4.2.

Occupation, age and religion are significant but seemingly unrelated structural variables for this factor. Farmwives, housewives, people in their twenties, and Roman Catholics believe that the community is slightly resistant to change, whereas clerical and sales workers, people forty and older, and Anglicans feel the community is slightly receptive to change.

c) The Future Growth factor includes variables that include attitudes towards population growth and attitudes towards one's personal future and the collective future of the community. The grand means of variables within the factor range from 5.0 to 5.5.

Interestingly, both the Anglicans and those who have lived in the community less than ten years are not as optimistic about future growth as are either the members of the United Church or the people who have lived longer in the community. Age differences appear to reflect religious differences.

Almost all groups would like to see the population of Unity grow (grand mean 5.2 / s.d. .92). Most groups think Unity is growing slowly and steadily (grand mean 4.8 / s.d. .97).* Only farmers think that the population

---

*Question: Do you think the population of this community is growing:
(Substantially decline) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Substantially grow) No opinion
(same)

is actually declining (3.6 / s.d. 1.4), which probably reveals the perspectives of rural people as they watch farm families move off the farms. In a related open-ended question, respondents were asked to name groups of people they would not like to see move into the community. Those listed (mentioned by four or more respondents) include: "criminals", Indians, Blacks, Hutterites and people who would not "contribute to the community" ("We don't want people who form clumps and do not participate in the community!").

Most respondents feel positive about the future of the community (grand mean 5.0 / s.d. 1.2) and their own personal futures (grand mean 5.0 / s.d. 1.1). Catholics are more optimistic than other religious groups about their personal futures (5.4 / s.d. 1.2). Males (5.2 / s.d. 1.1) are more optimistic than females (4.8 / s.d. 1.1). Farmwives (4.4) and housewives (4.7) consistently view their personal future less optimistically than do members of other occupational groups. Typical reasons given for being optimistic include a good business climate, enjoyment of work, satisfaction with town and people and presence of friends in the community. Less optimism seems to be based on expectations of recession, decline in agricultural markets, having little opportunity for job advancement and fear of loss of either spouse or health.

THE RETIRED

The retired perceive the social diversity of the community in much the same way as do the career adults. However, they feel their housing is less adequate than does any other group (4.6). They are also less optimistic about improvement in the standard of living in the next ten years than is any other group in the community. Their mean is 3.0 as compared to that of career adults, 3.9. Interestingly, the retired feel that the people of the community are more adaptable to change (4.8) than do the career adults (4.5). However, they are less interested in seeing the population of the community grow (4.9) than are the other groups (grand mean 5.2). Their assessment of their own personal future in the community is also less positive (4.4) than that of the career adults (grand mean 5.0).

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

High school students generally share the views of the other groups about the diversity of the community and the adequacy of housing. They are much more positive than any other group about the future standard of living (4.6). They are more certain that the people in the community can adapt to change (4.9). Also, the students desire more substantial population growth (5.5) than do either the career adults (5.2) or the retired (4.9).

FACTOR VARIABLES:

Factor 1: Social Diversity

Questions:

1. Are there many people of different backgrounds or lifestyles who live in this community: Yes/No

   .72 factor loading   64 percent yes

2. What is the quality of your housing in this community:

   (Very inadequate) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more than adequate)
   (adequate)

   .72 factor loading   5.0 mean   1.0 standard deviation

3. How do you think the standard of living in the next ten (10) years will compare with that of the past ten (10) years:

   (Will be much worse) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Will be much better) Don't know ___
   (same)

   .52 factor loading   3.9 mean   1.3 standard deviation

4. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

   4a. When Provincially or Federally financed recreation areas are developed in or near this community:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (same as present)

   -.42 factor loading   4.8 mean   1.3 standard deviation

5. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following sectors would you like to see jobs created:

   5a. Retail/Wholesale trade:

   (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   -.36 factor loading   4.6 mean   1.2 standard deviation

Factor 2: Attitudes Toward Change

Questions:

1. How would you describe the overall attitudes of this community toward change:

   (Very resistant) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very receptive) Don't know ___
   (neutral)

   .79 factor loading   4.5 mean   1.2 standard deviation

2. Do you think that your present net income is adequate for your needs:

   (Less than adequate) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (More than adequate)
   (adequate)

   -.65 factor loading   4.2 mean   1.2 standard deviation

3. If expansion occurs, in which of the following areas should job opportunities be expanded:

   3a. Professional: Yes/No

   -.35 factor loading   66 percent yes

Factor 3: Future Growth

Questions:

1. How would you like to see the population of this community change:

   (Substantially decline) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Substantially grow) No Opinion___
   (same)

   .74 factor loading   5.2 mean   .9 standard deviation

2. What do you think your personal future in this community is compared to the present:

   (Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know ___
   (same)

   .70 factor loading 5.0 mean 1.1 standard deviation

3. How do you think tourism affects the economy of this community:

   (Large financial loss to community) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Large financial gain to community) Don't know ___
   (no effect)

   .61 factor loading 5.4 mean 1.2 standard deviation

4. What do you think about Business Associations:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ___
   (neutral)

   .54 factor loading 5.5 mean 1.5 standard deviation

5. What do you think of the future of this community compared to the present:

   (Very poor) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very good) Don't know ___
   (same)

   .33 factor loading 5.0 mean 1.2 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: SOCIAL DIVERSITY

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean	.08	.91
Occupations			
--	Farmers	.05	.73
	Farmwives	-.23	.98
	Housewives	.22	.73
	Unskilled	.38	1.41
	Skilled	-.24	.81
	Clerical & Sales	-.24	.78
	Proprietors	-.11	.84
	Professionals	.18	.73
Influentials			
--	Influential	.13	.64
	Non-Influential	.08	.96
Community Participation			
.01	High	-.31	.88
	Low	.27	.87
Age			
.01	20-29	.61	.61
	30-39	.06	.78
	40-49	-.40	.61
	50-59	.19	1.04
	60-69	-.08	.77
	70+	.61	.23
Sex			
--	Male	.08	.73
	Female	.09	1.03
Religion			
.10	Anglican	-.35	.95
	United Church	.07	.76
	Roman Catholic	.36	.90
	Other	-.18	1.18
Ethnicity			
.01	British	-.29	.82
	German	.10	.68
	Other	1.07	.74
Years Residence			
.05	0-10	.53	1.03
	10-20	.00	.83
	20+	-.17	.77

*Level of Significance

FACTOR 2: ATTITUDES TOWARD CHANGE

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean	.02	.99
Occupations			
.05	Farmers	.25	.61
	Farmwives	-1.00	1.38
	Housewives	-.31	1.15
	Unskilled	.35	1.02
	Skilled	.10	.71
	Clerical & Sales	.47	.82
	Proprietors	.20	.53
	Professionals	.30	.71
Influentials			
.25	Influential	.36	.58
	Non-Influential	-.04	1.05
Community Participation			
--	High	-.09	.87
	Low	.07	1.06
Age			
.01	20-29	-.76	1.35
	30-39	-.51	1.32
	40-49	.29	.49
	50-59	.35	.56
	60-69	.53	.57
	70+	.27	.16
Sex			
--	Male	.15	.82
	Female	-.07	1.11
Religion			
.05	Anglican	.64	.81
	United Church	.06	.80
	Roman Catholic	-.30	1.30
	Other	.16	.30
Ethnicity			
.10	British	.23	.82
	German	-.28	1.18
	Other	-.07	1.07
Years Residence			
.25	0-10	.04	1.18
	10-20	-.27	1.32
	20+	.18	.53

*Level of Significance

FACTOR 3: FUTURE GROWTH

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean	.00	.99
Occupations			
--	Farmers	-.35	1.13
	Farmwives	.12	1.28
	Housewives	-.15	.99
	Unskilled	.42	.92
	Skilled	.07	1.42
	Clerical & Sales	-.09	.44
	Proprietors	-.04	.93
	Professionals	.05	.65
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.06	.95
	Non-Influential	.01	1.00
Community Participation			
--	High	-.03	1.17
	Low	.02	.90
Age			
.01	20-29	-.40	.99
	30-39	.79	.72
	40-49	-.18	.67
	50-59	.21	.97
	60-69	-.46	1.24
	70+	.88	.40
Sex			
--	Male	.03	1.07
	Female	-.01	.95
Religion			
.01	Anglican	-.78	.80
	United Church	.28	.81
	Roman Catholic	-.02	1.19
	Other	-.01	.69
Ethnicity			
--	British	.04	.84
	German	.02	1.02
	Other	-.16	1.31
Years Residence			
.01	0-10	-.40	1.03
	10-20	-.05	.90
	20+	.33	.92

*Level of Significance

ASSESSMENT SET 3: DEVELOPMENT

The factors of Agricultural and Urban Economic Development are included in this assessment set. The focus is on the community's attitudes toward development. Since no specific planning orientation directs this discussion of community development, a general treatment will be presented. When a specific planning orientation is outlined, more focused analysis and discussion are possible using the C.A.S. technique. Questions directly relevant to a specific planning orientation, it is presumed, will have been incorporated into the interview schedule.

a) The factor, Agricultural Development, includes assessments of the desirability of jobs being created in the farming, processing and transportation sectors. Assessments about local control over land use decisions also relate highly to this factor. The community generally assess agricultural and agriculturally-related development in a mildly positive way. The grand means of the significant variables range from 4.9 to 5.2.

The number of years people have lived in the community is the most significant structural variable related to this factor. People who have lived in the community between ten and twenty years make positive assessments of agricultural development whereas those who have lived in the community more than twenty years make negative assessments. The most negative assessments are made by those who have lived in the community less than ten years.

The people of Unity are, without a doubt, interested in community growth, expansion and development. However, as was noted in the discussion of Environment and Life, they do not want growth to substantially alter social life styles or the physical environment of the community. "Slow steady growth" is the phrase that most succinctly expresses the community's ideal, an ideal that also includes a desire for slightly more community control in the future over land use decisions (grand mean 5.2/s.d. 1.1).

Since the main economic base of Unity is agriculture, it is generally felt that stable and secure community economic expansion should occur in agriculture and agriculturally-related industries. Most groups desire the creation of more jobs in the farming, processing and transportation sectors, although skilled workers feel neutral about the expansion of jobs in farming (4.0/s.d. 2.0), with high community participants (4.6/s.d. 1.4), fifty to seventy year olds (50-59: 4.7/s.d. 1.4; 60-69: 4.7/s.d. 2.0) and people who have lived in the community for more than twenty years (4.8/s.d. 1.4) only slighly more concerned. The grand mean for the desirability of expanding job opportunities in the farming sector is 5.1 (s.d. 1.4).

Job expansion in the processing sector is desired by proprietors (5.6/s.d. 1.0), professionals (5.6/s.d. .96), influentials (5.7/s.d. .98), farmers (5.2/s.d. .78) and farmwives (5.2/s.d. 1.2). The younger age groups (20-50) are more interested in having job opportunities created in the processing sector than are older people; those residents who have lived in the community less than twenty years are more interested (0-10: 5.2/s.d. 1.5; 10-20: 5.4/s.d. 1.1) than are those who have lived longer in Unity (20+: 4.3/s.d. 1.7). Some respondents made suggestions about processing industries which might be developed in the community. The list includes a seed cleaning plant, grain processing and storing industries and a local creamery.

The desire for expansion in the transportation sector, especially in freight and delivery service to the community, is directly related to an interest in agricultural development. Farmers (5.0/s.d. .75), housewives (5.1/s.d. 1.3), proprietors (5.0/s.d. 1.6), semi-professionals and professionals

(5.4/s.d. .68) and influentials (5.2/s.d. 1.0) are more concerned than other groups about expansion in transportation. Younger people (20-40) (20-29: 5.6/s.d. .72; 30-39: 5.4/s.d. 1.3) and those who have been in the community less than twenty years (0-10: 5.5/s.d. 1.2; 10-20: 5.3/s.d. 1.0) also express interest. Freight transport, CNR express and freight as well as mail delivery are mentioned as needing improvement. Specifically, respondents believe that rates should be lowered, delivery times speeded up and freight damage reduced.

If agricultural development is to occur and if Unity is to expand as a service centre for agriculturally-related industries, respondents believe that more and better services must be offered to the farmers, especially at harvest time. Also, the community needs more mechanics and a readily available supply of parts and machinery. "Unity can only compete with larger cities if we offer better on-the-spot service", said one of the influentials.

b) The factor, Urban Economic Development, includes assessments about job expansion in trade, manufacturing and public administration. Assessments about Canada's future resource base are, also, a significant component of this factor. The community generally assess urban economic development positively. Grand means of the significant variables range from 4.4 to 5.3.

The assessments about urban economic development are significantly different among ethnic groups and years of residence groups. Germans and the 0-10 years of residence group make positive assessments, whereas the "Other" ethnic group and the 20+ years of residence group have negative responses to urban development. Since the cross tabulation of the structural variables shows that ethnicity and years of residence are only slightly related, it can be postulated that they are operating independently in this factor. Although the occupational variables are not significant in either factor in this assessment set, it is interesting to note that, while skilled workers and proprietors make negative assessments about agricultural development, they make positive assessments about urban economic development!

The community generally expresses a desire for introduction or expansion of manufacturing (grand mean 5.1/s.d. 1.3), retail and wholesale trade (4.6/ s.d. 1.2) and public administration (4.4/s.d. 1.3). Expansion of mining (5.1/s.d. 1.4), services (5.2/s.d. 1.3) and service institutions (4.9/s.d. 1.2) is also believed to be desirable. (It is interesting to note that the respondents are neutral about expanding finance and real estate industries (4.0/s.d. 1.5). This community consensus about expansion should be looked at in conjunction with the belief of 44% of the respondents that Canada is not running out of some resources. (12% did give a qualified answer to this question). Men (62% yes/9% qualified response) are more convinced than women (52% yes/ 14% qualified response) that some resources are running out. Farmers (80% yes/ 20% qualified response), semi-professionals and professionals (90% yes) and influentials (83% yes/4% qualified) are more convinced than are other groups that some of Canada's resources are running out.

Most respondents believe that the community should have more control not only over decisions on transportation and freight rates (5.2/s.d. 1.1), but also over decisions on pollution control (5.3/s.d. 1.2). Most believe that it is only "somewhat necessary" for airport facilities, railroad services, regular trucking and bus service and highways to be improved or expanded if expansion of the community is to take place. Several respondents, however, mention that Highway #14, west from Unity to Alberta, should be completed in order to attract more tourists into the area.

Businesses and services not presently available but desired for the community (all listed were mentioned by three or more respondents):

- shoe store
- dry cleaning shop
- taxi service (especially for the elderly)
- Redi-mix concrete
- sporting goods store
- auction mart

NOTE: About one quarter of the sample feel there is no need for more businesses or services in the community.

Businesses and services existing in the community but in need of improvement (all listed were mentioned by three or more respondents):

- drive-in restaurant
  How to improve: -better hours
  -more staff
  -Sunday opening
  -better service
  -should be out on highway
- clothing store
  How to improve: -enlarge and expand
  -"more privacy"
- mechanic shop-garages
- restaurants
  How to improve: -clean up
  -better hours
- another dentist is needed
- meals on wheels
- farm machinery (repairs/parts)
  How to improve: -competence
  -better service (especially at harvest time)

In answer to the question: "If the tax base of this community were substantially altered, would you be willing to pay more property taxes?", only 21% of all respondents reply positively. Males (42%) respond more favourably by far than females (6%). Influentials (64%) respond more positively than any other group.

THE RETIRED

Retired people in the community are generally less interested than the career adults in either agricultural (4.3) or urban economic (3.9) development. The means for career adults are 5.2 and 5.1 respectively. Only 27% of the retired believe that Canada is running out of some resources.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The high school students are even less interested than the retired people in agricultural (3.8) or urban economic (2.9) development. This pattern is consistent on all variables related to this factor. Interestingly, the students (79% yes) are more convinced than any other group that Canada is running out of some resources.

FACTOR VARIABLES:

Factor 1: Agricultural Development

Questions:

1. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following factors would you like to see jobs created:

   a) Farming: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   .82 factor loading   5.1 mean   1.4 standard deviation

   b) Processing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   .65 factor loading   4.9 mean   1.5 standard deviation

   c) Transportation: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   .49 factor loading   4.9 mean   1.4 standard deviation

2. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

   a) When policies are made regarding the use of land in and around this community:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .34 factor loading   5.2 mean   1.1 standard deviation

3. What do you think about Farmer's Associations:

(Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know: ____
(neutral)

.33 factor loading 4.9 mean 1.5 standard deviation

Factor 2: Urban Economic Development

Questions:

1. Are you concerned about Canada running out of some resources within the next ten years:

Yes/No/Don't Know

-.80 factor loading 56 percent yes

2. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following sectors would you like to see jobs created:

a) Manufacturing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

.53 factor loading 5.1 mean 1.3 standard deviation

3. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

a) When policies are made affecting pollution control in this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
(Same as
present)

.50 factor loading 5.1 mean 1.2 standard deviation

b) If policies are made which affect transportation and freight rates affecting this community:

(Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
(Same as
present)

.49 factor loading 5.2 mean 1.1 standard deviation

4. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following sectors would you like to see jobs created:

a) Retail/Wholesale trade: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

.41 factor loading 4.6 mean 1.2 standard deviation

4. b) Public Administration: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

.40 factor loading 4.4 mean 1.3 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.05	.93
Occupations			
--	Farmers	.27	.45
	Farmwives	.24	1.04
	Housewives	.20	.91
	Unskilled	.13	1.27
	Skilled	-.51	.48
	Clerical & Sales	-.02	.96
	Proprietors	-.26	.92
	Professionals	.13	.87
Influentials			
--	Influential	.09	.78
	Non-Influential	.05	.96
Community Participation			
--	High	.04	.78
	Low	.06	1.00
Age			
.25	20-29	.34	1.22
	30-39	.02	.84
	40-49	.30	.62
	50-59	-.22	.77
	60-69	-.14	.75
	70+	-.28	.12
Sex			
--	Male	-.02	.83
	Female	.11	1.00
Religion			
--	Anglican	.24	.54
	United Church	.15	.93
	Roman Catholic	-.11	1.10
	Other	.04	.71
Ethnicity			
.25	British	.13	.82
	German	.18	.66
	Other	-.33	1.41
Years of Residence			
.01	0-10	-.24	1.02
	10-20	.66	.92
	20+	-.09	.70

FACTOR 2: URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.01	.94
Occupations			
--	Farmers	-.51	.18
	Farmwives	-.21	1.11
	Housewives	.06	1.02
	Unskilled	.02	.81
	Skilled	.38	1.44
	Clerical & Sales	-.15	.73
	Proprietors	.24	.97
	Professionals	-.06	.48
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.13	.52
	Non-Influential	.03	.99
Community Participation			
--	High	-.09	.90
	Low	.06	.96
Age			
--	20-29	.05	.69
	30-39	.20	1.54
	40-49	-.11	.84
	50-59	.19	.61
	60-69	.10	.87
	70+	-.80	1.30
Sex			
--	Male	.05	.98
	Female	-.01	.91
Religion			
--	Anglican	-.24	.70
	United Church	-.07	.81
	Roman Catholic	.24	1.14
	Other	-.09	.83
Ethnicity			
.01	British	-.00	.78
	German	.43	1.12
	Other	-.63	.66
Years of Residence			
.01	0-10	.32	1.05
	10-20	.16	.88
	20+	-.30	.80

COMMUNICATION NETWORKS AND INFORMATION FLOWS

Some of the information collected about communication networks and information flows in the community relate specifically to this assessment set on development and are, therefore, discussed here.

Although the Lions Club and the Canadian Legion are believed to be the most influential organizations in Unity, those most interested in growth and expansion for the community are considered to be the Chamber of Commerce, service and civic clubs (including the Lions Club) and businessmen. The Chamber of Commerce and the Town Council are believed to have attempted to stimulate growth, but respondents do not agree on whether any of these organizations have actually succeeded.

Community concerns during the time of the survey focused on the issue of the demotion of the Separate School Principal (which occurred a few months before the survey) and the strike at the salt plant, in progress during the survey period.

In Unity, "businessmen" are generally believed to be the group most capable of solving community problems. They are most often selected from a list of fourteen professions which included scientists, sociologists, economists, etc. (See Table 6, page 138).

People were also asked what action they would be willing to take if they felt that development was having detrimental effects on the community. Respondents said they would be willing (in order of importance): 1) to make representations to Town Council; 2) to contact neighbours; 3) to contact community organizations; 4) to publish newsletters or distribute handouts; 5) to advertise in the mass media; 6) to form "grass-roots" groups; 7) to conduct door to door campaigns; and 8) to do nothing. From this, it is clear that if an unacceptable development were to be started in the community, the residents would not simply sit back and do nothing. They would first act through existing channels and organizations, and only if this procedure failed would more radical action be attempted.

Respondents were also asked if they were familiar with or had any contact with various federal and provincial agencies. Table 9, page tabulates the responses to this question. Respondents were also asked whether they believe that people working in government agencies treat their clients fairly and justly. Fifty-five per cent say yes, and 31% give a qualified response.

TABLE 1

Question:

In your opinion what organizations and/or associations have the most influence in this community?

Responses	(Times Mentioned)
1. Lions	44
2. Legion	34
3. Chamber of Commerce	28
4. Churches & church groups	25
5. Elks	24
6. Town Council	18
7. Recreational and sports organizations	17
8. Knights of Columbus	8

TABLE 2

Question:

What groups and individuals in this community are most interested in having the community grow?

Responses	(Times Mentioned)
1. Chamber of Commerce	27
2. Service & Civic Clubs	26
3. Businessmen	25
4. Town Council	17
5. Church groups	11
6. Town in general: everyone	7
7. Farmers	3

TABLE 3

Question:

What groups have succeeded in stimulating growth in this community:

Responses	(Times Mentioned)
1. Chamber of Commerce	29
2. Town Council	22
3. Service & Civic Clubs	19
4. Recreational & Sports organizations	4
5. Rural Municipality	3

TABLE 4

Question:

To your knowledge, has the local Board of Trade attempted to stimulate growth in this community:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

Table of Positive Response (Percent yes)

Structural Variables		1)	2)	3)	4)
	Grand mean:	12	42	30	13
Occupations					
.01	Farmers	40	20	40	0
	Farmwives	0	60	0	40
	Housewives	0	54	36	9
	Unskilled	12	25	25	37
	Skilled	50	37	0	12
	Clerical & Sales	0	37	50	12
	Proprietors	26	40	33	0
	Professionals	0	54	45	0
Influentials					
.02	Influential	0	38	61	0
	Non-Influential	15	43	25	16
Community Participation					
.01	High	25	44	30	0
	Low	6	41	31	20

TABLE 4 (continued)

		1)	2)	3)	4)
Age					
.07	20-29	13	48	11	26
	30-39	19	46	24	9
	40-49	7	50	29	12
	50-59	7	34	50	7
	60-69	29	27	35	7
	70+	0	26	73	0
Sex					
.01	Male	27	32	32	8
	Female	3	49	29	17
Religion					
--	Anglican	16	15	41	26
	United Church	9	45	36	8
	Roman Catholic	13	46	19	20
	Other	18	46	34	0
Ethnicity					
.09	British	7	40	38	12
	German	17	55	22	4
	Other	18	27	24	30
Years of Residence					
.10	0-10	9	33	35	20
	10-20	2	52	28	16
	20+	21	42	29	7

Question:

To your knowledge, has the local government attempted to stimulate growth in this community:

1) No serious attempts
2) Few Attempts
3) Many attempts
4) Don't know

Table of Positive Response (Percent yes)

Structural Variables		1)	2)	3)	4)
	Grand mean:	13	36	30	19
Occupations					
.01	Farmers	40	40	20	0
	Farmwives	20	0	0	80
	Housewives	0	27	45	27
	Unskilled	0	50	37	12
	Skilled	50	37	0	12
	Clerical & Sales	12	50	12	25
	Proprietors	13	46	33	6
	Professionals	9	45	45	0

TABLE 4 (continued)

		1)	2)	3)	4)
Influentials					
--	Influential	22	38	38	0
	Non-Influential	11	36	29	22
Community Participation					
.05	High	17	35	41	5
	Low	11	37	24	26
Age					
.03	20-29	2	54	20	22
	30-39	17	52	17	12
	40-49	11	20	28	39
	50-59	24	28	31	15
	60-69	20	20	52	7
	70+	0	13	86	0
Sex					
.01	Male	25	43	26	4
	Female	4	32	32	29
Religion					
--	Anglican	4	36	32	26
	United Church	13	28	38	19
	Roman Catholic	15	48	19	16
	Other	14	27	34	23
Ethnicity					
--	British	11	29	36	23
	German	12	49	18	18
	Other	18	34	34	13
Years of Residence					
.01	0-10	6	55	34	3
	10-20	8	34	30	26
	20+	20	26	27	25

TABLE 5

Question:

In order of importance, identify six specific community problems and/or issues of concern:

Responses	(Times mentioned)
1. Separate School problem	28
2. Salt plant strike	20
3. Water quality	15
4. Store hours	10
5. Senior citizen problems (housing, health)	9
6. Alcoholism	8
7. Lack of new industry and jobs	7
8. Lack of interest in community	6
9. Roads	5
10. Taxes	4
11. Drugs	3
12. Dog control	3

TABLE 6

Question:

What is the most important group of people you think should be most helpful in solving community problems: (Rank 5)

Responses	Total	Ranking				
		1)	2)	3)	4)	5)
1. Businessmen	91	37	17	18	7	12
2. Lawyers	48	8	7	18	11	14
3. Professional Organizers	47	9	8	6	14	10
4. Teachers	46	7	18	2	15	4
5. Farmers	42	5	5	8	17	7
6. Housewives	20	1	10	14	2	13
7. Government Agency Representatives	35	11	3	5	6	10
8. Planners	33	9	3	9	7	5
9. Politicians	30	5	14	4	4	3
10. Engineers	25	6	4	10		5
11. Economists	25	5	4	7	7	2
12. Bankers	25	2	4	3	13	3
13. Scientists	18	5	3	2	-	8
14. Labourers	16	-	5	-	2	9

TABLE 7

Question:

How do you think the people of this community might influence possible effects that development would have on this community:

Responses	(Times Mentioned)
1. Would be receptive and support it	9
2. Strengthen Chamber of Commerce	5
3. Use local government to control it	4
4. Greater community support of local business	4
5. Would be cautious	3

TABLE 8

Question:

If economic expansion and/or development was occurring in this community and you thought it would have detrimental effects on the community, what action would you be willing to take:

1) None: Yes/No
2) Publish newsletter or distribute handouts: Yes/No
3) Conduct door-to-door campaigns: Yes/No
4) Advertize in mass media: Yes/No
5) Contact neighbours: Yes/No
6) Contact community organizations: Yes/No
7) Form "grass-roots" groups: Yes/No
8) Make representations to town council: Yes/No

Please see Table 8 on next page . . .

TABLE 8 (continued)

Table of Positive Response (Percent yes)

Structural Variables	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
Grand mean:	10%[37]*	57% [8]	33% [8]	52% [8]	81% [6]	78% [6]	52% [7]	83% [2]
Occupations								
Farmers	0 [--]	80 [20]	40 [20]	20 [20]	60 [20]	80 [20]	40 [20]	100 [--]
Farmwives	0 [20]	40 [--]	20 [--]	20 [--]	100 [--]	.60 [--]	40 [20]	80 [--]
Housewives	18 [45]	54 [--]	45 [--]	81 [--]	81 [--]	81 [--]	54 [--]	72 [--]
Unskilled	0 [37]	75 [12]	25 [12]	50 [12]	87 [--]	75 [12]	62 [12]	87 [--]
Skilled	12 [50]	50 [12]	37 [12]	50 [12]	87 [12]	87 [12]	62 [12]	87 [12]
Clerical & Sales	25 [37]	37 [--]	12 [--]	25 [--]	100 [--]	75 [--]	37 [--]	87 [--]
Proprietors	12 [40]	53 [20]	33 [20]	45 [20]	60 [20]	73 [13]	46 [20]	86 [13]
Professionals	0 [45]	54 [18]	27 [18]	45 [18]	72 [13]	81 [--]	54 [9]	90 [--]
Influentials								
Influential	0 [25]	61 [19]	36 [19]	31 [19]	54 [19]	86 [3]	41 [13]	96 [3]
Non-Influential	12 [39]	56 [6]	33 [6]	56 [6]	86 [4]	77 [6]	54 [6]	81 [2]
Community Participation								
High	13 [38]	33 [15]	11 [15]	47 [15]	70 [15]	71 [8]	40 [12]	77 [3]
Low	9 [37]	69 [4]	45 [4]	55 [4]	87 [1]	82 [4]	58 [4]	87 [1]
Age								
20-29	22 [57]	44 [--]	57 [--]	55 [--]	84 [--]	100 [--]	49 [--]	100 [--]
30-39	3 [47]	58 [--]	51 [--]	69 [--]	96 [--]	87 [--]	80 [--]	100 [--]
40-49	11 [44]	37 [14]	14 [14]	66 [14]	76 [7]	64 [14]	51 [14]	69 [--]
50-59	14 [6]	52 [19]	40 [19]	29 [19]	77 [19]	83 [10]	36 [14]	89 [10]
60-69	-- [19]	92 [--]	32 [--]	56 [--]	87 [--]	85 [--]	56 [--]	92 [--]
70+	26 [73]	86 [13]	13 [13]	13 [13]	86 [13]	13 [13]	13 [13]	13 [13]
Sex								
Male	5 [34]	59 [16]	36 [16]	47 [16]	72 [16]	84 [10]	56 [14]	44 [5]
Female	14 [39]	55 [3]	52 [3]	55 [3]	87 [--]	74 [3]	49 [3]	55 [--]
Religion								
Anglican	0 [46]	40 [16]	16 [16]	41 [16]	100 [--]	73 [16]	61 [16]	90 [--]
United Church	11 [41]	50 [9]	23 [9]	37 [9]	66 [9]	69 [7]	64 [7]	77 [2]
Roman Catholic	12 [30]	66 [--]	53 [--]	71 [--]	93 [--]	88 [--]	58 [--]	86 [--]
Other	14 [34]	67 [21]	53 [21]	55 [21]	78 [21]	82 [10]	51 [21]	89 [10]
Ethnicity								
British	9 [42]*	45 [12]	28 [12]	50 [12]	75 [12]	75 [10]	49 [11]	87 [2]
German	5 [40]	66 [2]	38 [2]	77 [2]	90 [2]	96 [--]	59 [2]	90 [--]
Other	23 [22]	70 [6]	38 [6]	19 [6]	81 [6]	57 [6]	45 [6]	63 [6]
Years of Residence								
0-10	17 [24]	63 [0]	48 [--]	73 [--]	100 [--]	89 [--]	76 [--]	89 [--]
10-20	10 [45]	49 [8]	21 [8]	60 [8]	64 [8]	71 [--]	50 [5]	84 [--]
20+	6 [40]	57 [13]	31 [13]	34 [13]	79 [9]	75 [13]	37 [13]	79 [5]

*Numbers within brackets signify qualified positive response.

Levels of chi-square Significance
for Table 8

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
Occupations	.04	.05	--	.01	.10	--	--	.07
Influentials	.09	--	--	.09	.01	--	--	--
Community Participation	--	.01	.01	--	.02	--	--	--
Age	.01	.01	.02	.03	--	.01	.09	.01
Sex	--	.02	.03	.05	.01	.02	.04	.01
Religion	--	.06	.01	.01	.01	.15	.07	--
Ethnicity	--	--	--	.01	--	.02	--	.15
Years of Residence	--	--	.06	.01	.01	.01	.01	--

TABLE 9

Question:

Which of the following government agencies and projects are you familiar with or have had personal contact with:

Table of Positive Response (Percent yes)

	Familiar With	Contact With
1) Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	33	6
2) Canada Manpower Center	77	47
3) S.G.I.O.	84	76
4) Saskatchewan Land Bank	64	2
5) Saskatchewan Research Council	36	8
6) Workmen's Compensation Board	67	29
7) Advisory Council on Grain Crops	32	9
8) Saskatchewan Housing Corporation	49	10
9) Department of Northern Saskatchewan	38	0
10) Senior Citizens Commission	49	11
11) A.R.D.A. (Agricultural & Rural Development Act)	26	3
12) P.F.R.A. (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act)	67	20
13) Information Canada	39	7
14) Department of Veteran's Affairs	57	12
15) U.I.C. (Unemployment Insurance Commission)	88	42
16) Department of Indian Affairs	56	9

TABLE 10

Question:

Do you think in general people working in government agencies treat you fairly and justly: Yes/No/Sometimes

Table of Positive Response (Percent yes)

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	55	31
Occupations			
.18	Farmers	60	20
	Farmwives	60	40
	Housewives	54	27
	Unskilled	25	50
	Skilled	87	12
	Clerical & Sales	50	50
	Proprietors	53	33
	Professionals	72	27

continued

TABLE 10 (continued)

Table of Positive Response (Percent Yes) continued

		Mean	Standard Deviation
Influentials			
.02	Influential	83	3
	Non-Influential	50	14
Community Participation			
--	High	50	34
	Low	58	30
Age			
--	20-29	48	35
	30-39	46	36
	40-49	58	23
	50-59	55	43
	60-69	60	26
	70+	86	--
Sex			
--	Male	62	25
	Female	50	36
Religion			
.04	Anglican	73	26
	United Church	47	40
	Roman Catholic	70	16
	Other	21	54
Ethnicity			
--	British	51	32
	German	63	29
	Other	54	31
Years of Residence			
.14	0-10	44	39
	10-20	63	37
	20+	58	24

ASSESSMENT SET 4: LOCAL CONTROL

The factors of Environmental Control, Business Control and Control and Unskilled Labour comprise this assessment set. All these factors focus around the general question of local or non-local control over community affairs. It is assumed that opinions on these questions are of practical political importance.

a) The factor, Environmental Control, includes assessments about the desirability of local control over the local environment and pollution, the desirability of developing mining in the area (Unity is a potential source of potash) as well as attitudes about the natural surroundings of the community and the perceived need for more professionals in the community. The grand means range from 4.8 to 5.3. On the variables related to control, 1 represents the desirability of much less local control than at present and 7 the desirability of much more local control. The middle of the scale, 4, signifies that the amount of control now present is satisfactory.

Of the structural variables, age variations are the most significant. The groups range from positive to negative according to age, with the youngest age group (20-29) the most positive and the oldest (70+) the most negative. Some ethnic differences are important. Germans respond positively whereas those who are not German or British respond negatively. Some occupational differences can be noted: skilled workers and professionals give positive responses to local environmental control, while unskilled workers give negative responses.

The assessments related to this factor certainly cannot be understood as being "anti-development", but rather must be interpreted in light of the assessments analyzed in the preceding assessment set on development. There exists general consensus that the natural surroundings of the community are quite attractive (grand mean 5.0/s.d. 1.0). It would seem that this attitude is not based solely on aesthetics, since there is a conviction (grand mean 4.8/s.d. 1.3) that mining jobs should be expanded in the community. The interest in expansion of mining jobs may be, in part, an assessment resulting from the strike at the salt plant. The only structural variables significant for this variable are community participation and ethnicity. High community participants are more interested in mining expansion (5.4/s.d. .95) than are low participants (4.5/s.d. 1.4). British (5.1) are more interested than either Germans (4.3) or other ethnic groups (4.8).

If changes are to be made in policies which affect the local environment, it is generally agreed that there should be more local control than at present (grand mean 5.3/s.d. 1.0). No group believes that there should be less local control than at present. This same attitude is expressed about pollution decisions (grand mean 5.3/s.d. 1.2). The emphasis on local control may indicate that respondents question the ability of outsiders to solve what for them are defined as local problems.

If expansion is to occur in the community, respondents believe that more professionals are needed (66% yes/4% qualified). Only 20% of the farmers and 40% of the proprietors (13% qualified response) think more professionals are needed, whereas, in all other groups, more than 50% say they want more professionals. The local professional class, with interests in the community, is believed to be essential for community survival and success; the respondents tend to view the professionals as a special and important group.

b) The factor, Business Control, has as its most important assessment the belief that more local control should be exercised over decisions to establish new businesses in the community. Another assessment of importance in the factor is that family privacy is more important than being in touch with neighbours. It must be assumed that these variables relate on a value level, perhaps indicating the association of familialism and the local business community. The assessments of the community about the variables within this factor are only slightly above neutral, i.e., 4.5.

Occupational differences are the most significant structural variables for the factor. Unskilled, skilled and professional respondents make positive assesments, but, most interestingly, proprietors make very negative assessments. Perhaps proprietors conceptualize local control differently from the other groups. Proprietors may see such control as being exercised by the Town Council, for example, whereas the other groups may conceptualize local control much more generally. Low community participants make positive assessments, whereas high community participants make negative assessments. Both proprietors and high community participants seem to reject the desirability of local control over decisions to establish new businesses in the community perhaps because they believe that economic success depends on relationships to larger companies and on external economic conditions.

c) The final factor to be discussed within this assessment set has two distinct components, the expansion of unskilled labour and local control of schools and population changes. Assessments in this factor reflect a desire for local control not only over schools and population growth but also over the unskilled labour force. If there is an "adequate supply" of unskilled labour jobs, the community can hold many of its high school dropouts and graduate who do not desire to leave the community. The availability of these jobs may provide a reason, especially for the young, to remain in the community rather than to leave for further training or jobs. The general assessments of the community towards variables within this factor range only slightly above neutral, 4.9/4.7.

Age and religion are the most significant structural variables related to these assessments. The 40-49 age group and the members of the United Church make positive assessments, whereas the 50-59 age group, Anglicans and Roman Catholics make negative assessments.

THE RETIRED

The retired people generally desire more local control in all the areas discussed above than do the career adults. The grand means of the retired on the questions related to control range from 3.3 to 3.7.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The high school students also desire more local control than do the career adults. Students feel very negative about expansion of mining jobs (2.3). They want almost complete local control of policies related to pollution (3.4), new business (3.5) and population expansion (3.6). These results are difficult to interpret. It is surprising that their attitudes towards local control are so positive since a large majority also believe Canada is running out of some resources. These results might imply that either the students believe local people can be trusted with policy making, or their conception of depleting resources has not included any of the practical ramifications of this depletion for future planning.

FACTOR VARIABLES:

Factor 1: Environmental Control

Questions:

1. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

   a) If changes are to be made in policies which affect local environment:

   (Much less local control 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .67 factor loading 5.3 mean 1.0 standard deviation

2. If expansion occurs, in which of the following areas should job opportunities be expanded:

   Professional: Yes/No .58 factor loading
   66 percent yes

3. What do you think of the natural surroundings of this community:

   (Very unattractive) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very attractive) No opinion____
   (neutral)

   .53 factor loading 5.0 mean 1.0 standard deviation

4. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following sectors would you like to see jobs created:

   a) Mining: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   .41 factor loading 4.8 mean 1.3 standard deviation

5. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

   a) When policies are made affecting pollution control in this community:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .35 factor loading 5.3 mean 1.2 standard deviation

Factor 2: Business Control

Questions:

1. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

1. a) If a new business which would compete with already existing local enterprises were to be established:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .79 factor loading 4.5 mean 1.2 standard deviation

2. Do people in this community place more value on their family privacy than on being in touch with neighbours: Yes/No

   .60 factor loading 48 percent yes

Factor 3: Control and Unskilled Labour

Questions:

1. If expansion occurs, in which of the following areas should job opportunities be expanded:

   a) Unskilled: Yes/No

   .74 factor loading 76 percent yes

2. In comparison to the present situation, who should make decisions:

   a) If changes are to be made in the local schools:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .60 factor loading 4.9 mean 1.6 standard deviation

   b) If policies are made which affect the growth or decline of the population of this community:

   (Much less local control) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Much more local control)
   (Same as present)

   .57 factor loading 4.7 mean 1.0 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.03	1.01
Occupations			
.10	Farmers	-.17	1.06
	Farmwives	-.17	.34
	Housewives	.17	1.05
	Unskilled	-.56	.81
	Skilled	.55	1.26
	Clerical & Sales	-.18	.76
	Proprietors	.06	.91
	Professionals	.53	.98
Influentials			
--	Influential	.01	1.05
	Non-Influential	.04	1.01
Community Participation			
--	High	.12	1.13
	Low	.00	.95
Age			
.01	20-29	.68	.90
	30-39	.40	1.02
	40-49	-.06	.99
	50-59	-.24	.90
	60-69	-.38	1.02
	70+	-.59	.74
Sex			
.25	Male	.22	1.09
	Female	-.08	.93
Religion			
--	Anglican	.43	1.03
	United Church	-.03	1.12
	Roman Catholic	-.03	.93
	Other	.07	.82
Ethnicity			
.10	British	.07	1.04
	German	.25	1.05
	Other	-.38	.77
Years of Residence			
--	0-10	.12	.97
	10-20	-.14	.98
	20+	.09	1.05

FACTOR 2: BUSINESS CONTROL

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.05	.98
Occupations			
.01	Farmers	-.53	.61
	Farmwives	-.20	.90
	Housewives	-.24	.94
	Unskilled	.67	.90
	Skilled	.50	.90
	Clerical & Sales	.07	.54
	Proprietors	-.67	.84
	Professionals	.68	1.13
Influentials			
--	Influential	.14	1.10
	Non-Influential	.03	.97
Community Participation			
.05	High	-.30	.98
	Low	.21	.95
Age			
--	20-29	.11	.97
	30-39	-.33	1.22
	40-49	.17	.87
	50-59	.02	.92
	60-69	-.21	.58
	70+	-.48	.91
Sex			
--	Male	.07	1.04
	Female	.03	.95
Religion			
--	Anglican	-.17	.81
	United Church	-.06	.99
	Roman Catholic	.15	1.07
	Other	.35	.84
Ethnicity			
--	British	.02	.96
	German	.07	1.06
	Other	.11	.97
Years of Residence			
.25	0-10	.10	1.25
	10-20	.28	.88
	20+	-.13	.81

FACTOR 3: CONTROL AND UNSKILLED LABOUR

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.00	1.01
Occupations			
.25	Farmers	-.38	1.10
	Farmwives	.07	.55
	Housewives	-.03	1.03
	Unskilled	-.38	.84
	Skilled	.28	1.49
	Clerical & Sales	-.13	.81
	Proprietors	.14	.97
	Professionals	.67	.64
Influentials			
--	Influential	.13	1.01
	Non-Influential	-.03	1.01
Community Participation			
--	High	.14	1.18
	Low	-.08	.92
Age			
.01	20-29	.00	.99
	30-39	-.22	1.24
	40-49	.49	1.02
	50-59	-.15	.79
	60-69	-.77	.55
	70+	.32	.37
Sex			
.25	Male	.18	1.08
	Female	-.14	.95
Religion			
.01	Anglican	-.30	.90
	United Church	.49	.92
	Roman Catholic	-.41	.98
	Other	-.15	.90
Ethnicity			
.25	British	.11	.97
	German	-.28	1.17
	Other	.05	.80
Years of Residence			
--	0-10	-.09	1.02
	10-20	.19	1.09
	20+	-.07	.96

ASSESSMENT SET 5: EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The assessment set, Employment Opportunities, includes two factors, Blue Collar Job Opportunities and White Collar Job Opportunities.

a) Blue Collar Job Opportunities. Respondents generally want more semi-skilled and skilled jobs opportunities and more jobs in manufacturing to be created in Unity. For example, the community's grand mean for desiring job expansion in manufacturing is 5.1.

Influence and ethnicity are the most significant structural variables affecting this factor, with the influentials and the British making the most positive assessments. Also, high community participants, clerical and sales workers, proprietors and professionals make positive assessments.

The reasons respondents desire job expansion in the blue collar sector are quite different from the reasons given for desiring more unskilled job opportunities, as discussed in an earlier section. Unskilled jobs are seen as providing opportunities for young people who wish to remain in the community and also as a source of labourers potentially trainable as semi-skilled or skilled workers. The expansion of blue collar jobs is seen as necessary if Unity is to remain a viable service centre.

b) White Collar Job Opportunities. Here, respondents assess the desirability of expanding employment opportunities for managers, semi-professionals, clerical and sales workers. There was much variability in response with assessments ranging from high to low.

Sex and religion are the most significant structural variables. Males, Anglicans and Roman Catholics make positive assessments of white collar job expansion; females and the religious group, "Other", make negative assessments.

Obviously, the desirability of job expansion in the blue collar and white collar areas are assessed differently by different structural groups.

Summary of Responses to Job Opportunity Expansion (based on analysis of open-ended questions):

1. Unskilled Jobs. There should be more unskilled job opportunities. The unskilled now leave the community because there are no jobs: "must have something for those with little training to do"; "need such jobs to prevent people from going on welfare"; "increase youth opportunities in the community". However, a few respondents (6) strongly believe that there are enough unskilled jobs now. It should be noted that unskilled labour is perceived separately and distinctly than other occupational groups (with the exception of professionals) by the community. See the factor, Control and Unskilled Labour, in the assessment set titled Local Control, p. 145.

2. Semi-Skilled Jobs. Job opportunities of this kind, especially for the young and uneducated should be expanded: "need farm help"; "to prevent welfare"; "to improve quality of community population"; "a means of training people". Two respondents believe that there are enough jobs at this level.

3. Skilled Jobs. Skilled jobs are needed to provide job opportunities for the unskilled and semi-skilled workers: "to prevent loss to other towns"; "opportunities for the young"; "necessary for community expansion and growth"; "opportunity for advancement". A few (5) feel there are presently enough skilled workers in the community.

4. Clerical Jobs. Twenty-seven respondents believe this area does not need expansion. A few respondents (4), however, believe that an expansion

of clerical jobs would provide work opportunities for women and young people.

5. Management Jobs. Some respondents believe more of these types of jobs should be created: "such people contribute to community leadership and growth"; "they teach others to do their jobs". And some respondents recommend that local people should be hired more frequently for existing management positions. Over thirty respondents, however, believe there are already sufficient available jobs in management.

6. Sales Jobs. Thirty-seven respondents say there are plenty of sales positions. However, several respondents believe that more effort should be made to hire better-qualified people for these positions.

7. Semi-professional Jobs. The respondents are divided in their opinions. Twenty-seven believe there are already enough semi-professionals in the community; twenty-four believe that more are needed. Perhaps, this mixed response reflects the rapidly-changing definitions of this kind of jobs.

8. Professional Positions. Professionals are considered separately and distinctly from other occupational groups by the community. The presence of professionals in the community is not only desired but is considered to be essential for the growth and autonomy of the community. At the present time, it is suggested that Unity needs at least one more doctor, dentist, lawyer, architect, and certified accountant.

9. Proprietor Jobs. Most respondents state that the community presently has enough proprietors. However, many wish that local people could be hired as proprietors rather than outsiders who represent national or regional chains. Negative attitudes towards chain stores are frequently expressed.

POSITIVE RESPONSES TOWARD JOB EXPANSION

JOB TYPES	CAREER ADULT	STUDENTS	RETIRED
Unskilled	76% [2%]*	66%	58% [17%]
Semi-Skilled	83% [4%]	100%	93%
Skilled	78% [4%]	26% [71%]	54% [23%]
Management	36% [6%]	9% [86%]	10% [28%]
Sales	36% [3%]	11% [84%]	30% [23%]
Clerical	53% [4%]	9% [83%]	24% [17%]
Semi-Professional	52% [6%]	9% [86%]	46% [23%]
Professionals	66% [4%]	11% [83%]	35% [17%]
Proprietors	41% [4%]	1% [94%]	13% [23%]

[*Percentages in brackets represent qualified responses.]

THE RETIRED

Retired people are very uninterested in expanding jobs in the manufacturing sector (3.9). They also consistently are less interested than are the career adults in the expansion of all employment opportunities with the exception of semi-skilled job opportunities. Ninety-three per cent of the retired people believe semi-skilled employment opportunities should be expanded.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

High school students express even less interest in the expansion of jobs in the manufacturing sector (2.9) than do the retired. The high school students are generally less clear in their opinions about the expansion of job opportunities than are either the retired or career adults. The major response is qualified for each category except for semi-skilled jobs. Here, 100% of the students believe these must be expanded. This unanimity no doubt reflects their awareness of their own employment needs while in school and afterwards if they are to be able to stay in the community.

FACTOR VARIABLES

Factor 1: Blue Collar Job Opportunities

Questions:

1. If expansion occurs, in which of the following areas should job opportunities be expanded:

   a) Semi-skilled: Yes/No

   .83 factor loading   78 percent yes

   b) Skilled: Yes/No

   .63 factor loading   83 percent yes

2. If more jobs were to be created in this community, in which of the following sectors would you like to see jobs created:

   a) Manufacturing: (Very much dislike) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very much like)

   .34 factor loading   5.1 mean   1.3 standard deviation

3. Is having relatives living nearby important to you:

   (Very unimportant) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very important) Don't know ___
   (neutral)

   -.34 factor loading   4.5 mean   1.6 standard deviation

Factor 2: White Collar Job Opportunities

Questions:

1. If expansion occurs, in which of the following areas should job opportunities be expanded:

   a) Management, Officials: Yes/No

   .86 factor loading   36 percent yes

   b) Semi-Professionals: Yes/No

   .58 factor loading   52 percent yes

1. c) Sales: Yes/No

   .57 factor loading 36 percent yes

   d) Clerical: Yes/No

   .54 factor loading 53 percent yes

   e) Skilled: Yes/No

   .35 factor loading 78 percent yes

2. How do you feel about moving away from this community:

   (Very uninterested) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very interested) Don't know ___

   .36 factor loading 2.2 mean 1.3 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: BLUE COLLAR JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.05	.97
Occupations			
.05	Farmers	.36	.45
	Farmwives	-.24	.72
	Housewives	-.14	.83
	Unskilled	-.15	1.06
	Skilled	-.39	1.37
	Clerical & Sales	.56	.75
	Proprietors	.47	1.16
	Professionals	.74	.65
Influentials			
.01	Influential	.71	.72
	Non-Influential	-.06	.97
Community Participation			
.05	High	.34	.93
	Low	-.07	.97
Age			
--	20-29	.12	.73
	30-39	-.05	1.01
	40-49	.06	.73
	50-59	.26	.79
	60-69	.06	1.49
	70+	.45	.93
Sex			
.25	Male	.21	1.03
	Female	-.05	.93
Religion			
.25	Anglican	.16	1.01
	United Church	.25	.96
	Roman Catholic	-.09	.86
	Other	-.26	1.23
Ethnicity			
.01	British	.40	.72
	German	-.33	1.12
	Other	-.24	1.03
Years of Residence			
.10	0-10	-.03	1.16
	10-20	-.16	1.02
	20+	.25	.76

FACTOR 2: WHITE COLLAR JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.02	1.01
Occupations			
.25	Farmers	.69	.21
	Farmwives	-.41	.90
	Housewives	-.24	1.33
	Unskilled	-.11	.97
	Skilled	.40	.71
	Clerical & Sales	-.35	.89
	Proprietors	.14	.76
	Professionals	.11	.54
Influentials			
.25	Influential	.27	.54
	Non-Influential	-.08	1.07
Community Participation			
--	High	-.07	.95
	Low	-.00	1.05
Age			
.25	20-29	.12	.32
	30-39	.23	.62
	40-49	.07	1.27
	50-59	-.31	.97
	60-69	-.50	1.57
	70+	.54	.86
Sex			
.01	Male	.38	.60
	Female	-.30	1.14
Religion			
.01	Anglican	.46	.77
	United Church	.00	.72
	Roman Catholic	.33	.61
	Other	-1.58	1.40
Ethnicity			
.25	British	-.20	1.10
	German	.15	1.10
	Other	.15	.49
Years of Residence			
.25	0-10	-.13	1.05
	10-20	.27	.63
	20+	-.12	1.15

ASSESSMENT SET 6: INCOME SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The factors relating to Financial Support and Job Support systems are grouped together in this assessment set. A factor which assesses the advantages of geographical Mobility is also included. Mobility may be seen as a reasonable alternative to restricted opportunities in income and jobs within the community.

a) The Financial Support factor includes assessments of Unemployment Insurance, a Guaranteed Annual Income and Social Assistance. The assessments of the community toward variables in this factor range from neutral (4.0) to quite negative (2.2).

High community participants and the British make lower assessments than do low community participants and Germans. People who have lived in the community for less than ten years assess this factor positively, perhaps because a large number of the low community participants are in this group.

Generally, respondents are neutral in their assessments of Unemployment Insurance (4.0/s.d. 1.6), Social Assistance (3.8/s.d. 1.5) and the possibility of a Guaranteed Annual Income (3.9/s.d. 1.6). Occupation is the most significant of all structural variables in relation to all three assessments. Sex and religion are also significant but only with respect to the assessment of a Guaranteed Annual Income. Unskilled and skilled workers are most positive in their attitudes toward Unemployment Insurance (5.0/s.d. 1.4; 5.5/s.d. 1.2), whereas proprietors are least positive (3.1/s.d. 1.6). Farmwives (2.8/s.d. 1.2) and proprietors (2.7/s.d. 1.6) are negative in their attitudes toward Social Assistance, and again, unskilled (4.7/s.d. 1.3), skilled workers (4.5/s.d. 1.6) and professionals (4.3/s.d. 1.3) are the most positive. The picture changes somewhat in relation to a Guaranteed Annual Income. In general, the community is neutral (3.9/s.d. 1.6), but skilled workers are most positive (5.0/s.d. 1.4), followed by professionals (4.7/s.d. 1.9), farmwives (4.6/ s.d. 1.9) and farmers (4.2/s.d. 1.1). Housewives are least positive (3.0/ s.d. 1.6). Males are more positive (4.5/s.d. 1.5) than females (3.4/s.d. 1.6). Anglicans are least positive (2.8/s.d. 1.7), whereas members of the United Church (4.1/s.d. 1.7) and those in the religious category, "Other" (4.9/s.d. .75), are found to be most positive.

b) The factor, Job Support, includes assessments made about whether the government should create jobs in the community for people who cannot find work. It also includes attitudes toward farm associations and business associations. These organizations can be understood as spokesmen for the self-employed in the community. Attitudes towards mobility are important here, as reflecting a possible recognition that mobility is one way to achieve better jobs. The assessments about these variables range from 4.9 to 5.5. However, the attitude toward moving away from the community has a grand mean of only 2.2.

Religious differences provide the most significant source of variation, with, for example, Anglicans making particularly negative assessments. Occupation, also, is important. Farmers and unskilled labourers tend to make negative assessments here. It is not clear why unskilled labourers are opposed to the creation of new jobs by the government, unless they feel that they would not qualify for these jobs or otherwise benefit from their creation.

c) The Mobility factor includes assessments of whether it is realistic for graduating high school students to remain in the community and of how the respondents themselves feel about moving away. Attitudes toward trade unions are significant in the factor, possibly because of the salt plant strike. At the time the interviews were conducted, many striking employees were seeking other temporary employment.

High community participants made the most positive assessments on this factor. This is unexpected, but not likely to be important considering that few people in the community show any interest in moving away from it, despite the conviction of many that it is not realistic for graduating high school students to remain.

THE RETIRED

The retired people generally respond more favourably toward the variables in the Financial Support factor than do career adults. While the mean of the retired about Unemployment Insurance is 4.3, only slightly higher than that of the career adults, 4.0, the retired feel more positive about a Guaranteed Annual Income (4.5) and Social Assistance (4.6) than do the career adults (3.9 and 3.8 respectively). The retired respond less favourably toward the variables concerning Job Support than do the career adults. They are also less satisfied with the adequacy of their income (3.4) than the career adults (4.2), a not surprising finding! One might have expected that the retired would be even more favourably disposed toward a Guaranteed Annual Income and Social Assistance than they are. This group expresses the least interest of all groups in moving away from the community (1.7).

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Most of the variables in this set were not part of the high school questionnaire so that no comparative analysis is possible. High school students do express a higher interest than other groups in moving away from Unity, but their mean is only 4.1. Most of them want to stay if only they can find a suitable future in Unity (or in a community like it).

FACTOR VARIABLES

Factor 1: Financial Support Systems

Questions:

1. What do you think about Unemployment Insurance:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .86 factor loading 4.0 mean 1.6 standard deviation

2. What do you think about a Guaranteed Annual Income:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .65 factor loading 3.9 mean 1.6 standard deviation

3. What do you think about people receiving Social Assistance:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .58 factor loading 3.8 mean 1.5 standard deviation

4. What do you think about trade unions:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .38 factor loading 3.4 mean 1.4 standard deviation

Factor 2: Job Support Systems

Questions:

1. What do you think about the government creating jobs in a community for people of the community who cannot find work:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .88 factor loading 5.2 mean 1.4 standard deviation

2. What do you think about Farmer's Associations:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .56 factor loading 4.9 mean 1.5 standard deviation

3. What do you think about Business Associations:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .36 factor loading 5.5 mean 1.5 standard deviation

4. How do you feel about moving away from this community:

   (Very uninterested) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very interested) Don't know ____

   .33 factor loading 2.2 mean 1.3 standard deviation

Factor 3: Mobility

Questions:

1. In your opinion is it realistic for graduating high school students to remain in this community:

   (Very unrealistic) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very realistic) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   -.83 factor loading 3.0 mean 1.4 standard deviation

2. What do you think about trade unions:

   (Very unfavourable) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very favourable) Don't know ____
   (neutral)

   .47 factor loading 3.4 mean 1.4 standard deviation

3. How do you feel about moving away from this community:

   (Very uninterested) 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 (Very interested) Don't know ____

   .40 factor loading 2.2 mean 1.3 standard deviation

FACTOR 1: FINANCIAL SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.03	.99
Occupations			
.25	Farmers	-.55	.78
	Farmwives	-.89	1.62
	Housewives	.20	1.16
	Unskilled	-.11	1.05
	Skilled	.17	.56
	Clerical & Sales	-.24	.40
	Proprietors	-.20	.71
	Professionals	.34	.53
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.02	.90
	Non-Influential	-.03	1.01
Community Participation			
.01	High	-.51	.82
	Low	.18	.99
Age			
.25	20-29	-.27	1.03
	30-39	.21	1.47
	40-49	-.05	.65
	50-59	-.11	.61
	60-69	.00	1.00
	70+	1.04	.45
Sex			
--	Male	.09	.75
	Female	-.12	1.12
Religion			
.05	Anglican	-.33	.56
	United Church	-.33	1.11
	Roman Catholic	.24	.90
	Other	.37	.87
Ethnicity			
.01	British	-.33	1.00
	German	.38	.83
	Other	.10	.96
Years of Residence			
.05	0-10	.33	1.03
	10-20	-.30	.94
	20+	-.13	.93

FACTOR 2: JOB SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	-.06	.99
Occupations			
.10	Farmers	-.47	1.43
	Farmwives	-.18	1.08
	Housewives	.15	.92
	Unskilled	-.62	.78
	Skilled	.08	1.38
	Clerical & Sales	.19	.57
	Proprietors	.30	.61
	Professionals	-.06	.93
Influentials			
.25	Influential	.23	.59
	Non-Influential	-.11	1.05
Community Participation			
--	High	-.13	.99
	Low	-.02	1.01
Age			
--	20-29	-.04	1.26
	30-39	-.17	1.16
	40-49	-.26	.90
	50-59	.31	.62
	60-69	-.07	1.25
	70+	.16	.37
Sex			
--	Male	-.15	1.20
	Female	-.00	.83
Religion			
.01	Anglican	-.93	.97
	United Church	.21	.70
	Roman Catholic	-.01	.99
	Other	-.21	1.35
Ethnicity			
.10	British	-.14	.90
	German	.24	1.17
	Other	-.34	.89
Years of Residence			
--	0-10	-.12	1.03
	10-20	.03	.69
	20+	-.08	1.13

FACTOR 3: MOBILITY

Structural Variables		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Grand mean:	.01	1.03
Occupations			
.25	Farmers	-.50	.62
	Farmwives	-.50	1.64
	Housewives	.11	1.04
	Unskilled	.50	1.12
	Skilled	.00	.79
	Clerical & Sales	-.44	.90
	Proprietors	.00	1.31
	Professionals	-.04	.51
Influentials			
--	Influential	-.19	.80
	Non-Influential	.04	1.07
Community Participation			
.10	High	.28	1.03
	Low	-.11	1.02
Age			
.25	20-29	-.29	1.07
	30-39	-.25	1.20
	40-49	-.11	.57
	50-59	.22	1.00
	60-69	.21	.98
	70+	.77	1.64
Sex			
--	Male	-.10	.78
	Female	.08	1.18
Religion			
.25	Anglican	-.21	.82
	United Church	.14	.92
	Roman Catholic	-.19	1.28
	Other	.35	.67
Ethnicity			
--	British	.06	.88
	German	.13	.85
	Other	-.32	1.55
Years of Residence			
--	0-10	-.00	1.17
	10-20	-.14	.95
	20+	.11	.99

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The C.A.S. is a research technique designed to probe the perceptions and attitudes of a community population toward planned economic expansion and social development in their community. Such a research technique has long been needed. From application of the C.A.S., important data can be derived and incorporated into that information base on which decision makers (local and non-local) must rely when engaged in fundamental or incremental planning. The C.A.S. is designed to be used for the following purposes: a) to generate suggestions (some of which come directly from community members) for general or specific modifications which might be introduced into a community; b) to ascertain the attitudes and possible reactions of a population to a specific proposed modification: c) to provide some insight into the relations between the orientations of the population and the structures of the community; and d) to monitor the assessments made by a population during the stages of any actual development program.

The C.A.S. uses traditional techniques of social science for gathering information from the community population. A representative sample of inhabitants from each of the occupational strata of the community is randomly selected from election enumeration lists. Individuals in the sample are interviewed by members of a team of trained researchers. The interview schedule is constructed to probe attitudes of the population as well as to ascertain possible reactions to and suggestions for potential community modifications. The researchers live in the community during the entire interviewing period. They keep daily journals of informal observations, conversations with local inhabitants and their own perceptions of the community. Several intensive de-briefing sessions are held among interviewers and research staff immediately after the interviewing is completed. The large amount of attitudinal and structural data obtained from the interviews is controlled and analyzed through statistical manipulation. The results of this analysis are interpreted with the aid of the informal journal data and the insights of the researchers.

The interview schedule is designed to accommodate information relating to a large number of attitudinal variables. The significance of these variables as well as their interrelationships with each other and with the structural variables* needs to be determined in a reasonably parsimonious fashion. The reporting of a large amount of raw data would simply obscure these interrelationships. Factor analysis is used to determine the dimensions that underlie the attitudes elicited from the survey sample. The reliability of the interpretation given to these dimensions rests upon the observational insights of the researchers and on how well the interpretation agrees with an a priori postulation of the dimensions and variables expected to be central for this particular population.

When the factor analysis is complete, the factor score of each case for each dimension is calculated. An analysis of variance of the factor scores is used to summarize the results of the analysis of variance of each of the statistically significant variables. The factor analysis and the analysis of variance of the factor scores are extremely useful ways to summarize, structure, and order the large amount of information collected in the course of a C.A.S. application.

In the community in which the C.A.S. was applied and tested, seventeen factors were generated and these factors were interpreted as composing six theoretical groupings called "assessment sets". The list of these assessment sets and their associated factors follows:

---

*The structural variables to be used are occupation, influence, community participation, age, sex, religion, ethnic group membership, years or residence).

A. Environment and Life
    1. Community Environment
    2. Community Solidarity
    3. Community Life
    4. Social Interaction
B. Diversity and Growth
    1. Social Diversity
    2. Attitudes Toward Change
    3. Future Growth
C. Development
    1. Agricultural Development
    2. Urban Economic Development
D. Local Control
    1. Environmental Control
    2. Business Control
    3. Control and Unskilled Labour
E. Employment Opportunities
    1. Blue Collar Job Opportunities
    2. White Collar Job Opportunities
F. Income Support Systems
    1. Financial Support Systems
    2. Job Support Systems
    3. Mobility

In addition to making analysis of these assessments sets possible, the C.A.S. taps communication and influence networks and flows within the community. This kind of information will often be of particular importance to planners.

The C.A.S. might be challenged as being too ponderous, too long and, therefore, of little utility for planners. Critics might suggest that the interview schedule should have fewer and more-focussed questions. After all, planners only need specific information in specific areas in order to plan. In response, one should note that sometimes "specific information" is thought to include only that information obtained from "objective" sources. Objective sources are considered to include indirect measurement of the basis of census data, unobtrusive measures, objective social indicators, etc. However, even when specific information is understood as meaning knowledge about the attitudes, feelings and concerns of a population toward development, critics sometimes fail to recognize the importance of placing these within the broader social context. The C.A.S. was developed on the premise that merely to be able to enumerate attitudes of community members concerning specific proposals is insufficient for intelligent planning. Planners must also be well-informed about the social environment within which these specific attitudes are embedded. Unless this knowledge is available, deleterious social consequences may be unavoidable. An understanding by planners of the context of the attitudes expressed may enable them to reduce any negative impact of change. The C.A.S. does provide information about specific topics of interest to planners, but it does so in a manner that respects the complexities of human attitudes and the significance and importance of the community to the inhabitants.

Chapter IV, Demonstration: The Unity Study, presents a brief analysis of some of the data collected in the first application of the C.A.S. It is presented to demonstrate the usefulness of the C.A.S. technique for discovering and understanding community attitudes toward development. Since the actual study done at Unity was for the purposes of developing and testing the new instrument, no specific planning objective was being investigated. Therefore, the findings are presented primarily in general terms. From this presentation, the important steps in applying the instrument, analyzing the data and interpreting the analysis should be apparent.

The C.A.S. provides reliable and objective information; it can be applied and analyzed rapidly and relatively inexpensively; it can and should be easily adapted to reflect specific planning concerns. It is hoped that planners will find the C.A.S. useful to them and apply it when contemplating community modifications. With each application, the technique will be further refined and thus become increasingly useful.